HOUSE OF COMMONS DEBATES

OFFICIAL REPORT

THIRD SESSION—THIRTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT

42 Elizabeth II

VOLUME XVI, 1993

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE SECOND DAY OF JUNE, 1993
TO THE TWENTY-THIRD DAY OF JUNE, 1993

INDEX ISSUED IN A SEPARATE VOLUME

Published under authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons by the Queen's Printer for Canada

Available from Canadian Communication Group — Publishing, Supply and Services Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, June 2, 1993

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 31

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL ACCESS AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. Guy Saint-Julien (Abitibi): Madam Speaker, in June 1989, our Prime Minister, the Right Hon. Brian Mulroney, signed the official declaration for National Access Awareness Week, inviting all Canadians to make this week a special event and improve the quality of life in their communities.

Since then, communities across Canada have improved access to public places, services and facilities for persons with disabilities. However, much remains to be done to eliminate all barriers encountered by the disabled, who are entitled to take an active part in the daily life of their community and to have access to the same basic services as the rest of the population.

The impact of National Access Awareness Week should last throughout the year.

* * *

TIOXIDE CANADA

Mrs. Shirley Maheu (Saint-Laurent—Cartierville): Madam Speaker, Tioxide Canada, a company that pollutes the waterways of Quebec with no apology whatsoever, has just been fined $4 million, which is peanuts. The company heaved a sigh of relief, because it was expecting a fine of $36 million as well as prison terms for some of its board members. What a difference a fine makes.

Why does the government not impose sentences that would deter effect polluters? Although Environment Quebec now has two cases pending against Tioxide Canada, the Crown merely rapped the company's knuckles. The Conservative government had a moral obligation to go to the wall on this. This is certainly no way to clean up our environment. The federal government must wake up and impose sentences that will make all polluters think twice. Tomorrow, it will be too late.

* * *

THE ABB PLANT

Mr. Marcel R. Tremblay (Québec-Est): Madam Speaker, I was delighted to hear that ABB, a high tech company in my riding, has taken another step to make its Quebec plant one of its most important condenser manufacturing units in the world.

• (1405)

Since it opened in 1991, the Quebec plant has been growing steadily and will double its capacity for the production of condensers by the first quarter of 1994, to supply the North American market.

ABB employs about 2,700 people in more than 35 plants in Canada and has annual sales of about $1 billion. It is involved in many activity sectors including the production, transmission and distribution of electric power, industrial automation, steam generating systems, robotics, measuring instruments, environmental technologies, telecommunications and high-speed trains. The people of Quebec are proud to be part of the technology boom generated by ABB's experts.

* * *

[*English*]

SMALL BUSINESS LOANS

Mr. Robert D. Nault (Kenora—Rainy River): Madam Speaker, the Royal Bank announced discounts of 10 per cent on service charges for small businesses. The major financial institutions continue to miss the point. Figures from October 1991 to October 1992 show that the value of small business loans by the big six banks increased by a

modest 3.8 per cent, compared with a 12 per cent increase for loans to large corporations.

In the same period 450,000 new jobs were created by small business. By contrast, large organizations cut 96,500 people from their payrolls.

Most will know that last year the financial institutions increased their service charges, in some cases by 400 per cent. Now they want us to believe they are doing us a favour by reducing service charges to small businesses by 10 per cent. They control the majority of lending to business. Given that position, they are not just responsible to their shareholders, they are responsible to the country.

The big six have two choices: Change their ways or get ready for the onslaught of new banks in this country.

* * *

QUEEN ELIZABETH II

Mr. Doug Fee (Red Deer): Madam Speaker, today is the 40th anniversary of an historic event. On June 2, 1953 our sovereign, Queen Elizabeth II, was crowned Queen of Canada and took an oath to govern the peoples of Canada and her other realms according to their respective laws and customs. In response to this oath parliamentarians, new citizens and those entering into the Queen's service take a reciprocal oath of allegiance to Her Majesty.

Four days prior to her coronation the Queen issued a proclamation under the Canadian Royal Style and Titles Act officially adopting the title of Queen of Canada, thereby fulfilling the dreams of the Fathers of Confederation who often referred to Queen Victoria as the Queen of Canada.

I would like to quote two famous Canadians, one a Conservative and one a Liberal, who lived a century apart. Sir George-Étienne Cartier said that the monarchy was the essential element of the Constitution and Vincent Massey said: "The monarchy is essential to us. Without it as a bastion of Canadian nationality, Canadian purpose and Canadian independence we could not remain a sovereign state".

God save the Queen.

VISITORS' VISAS

Mr. Dan Heap (Trinity—Spadina): Madam Speaker, today's edition of *The Ottawa Citizen* highlights the frustrations faced by Canadians with relatives still residing in their former countries such as Lebanon, Guyana, and India, to name a few.

Many of those relatives would like to visit Canada before the death of loved ones and not just for burial ceremonies. The government seems to assume that everyone applying to enter Canada from a country with civil unrest or poverty will stay illegally even when the applicant has a spouse, two children and a family business back home.

Canada is now home to over four million foreign-born people, representing 16 per cent of the population. I call on the Minister of Employment and Immigration to review the duty of overseas officers in deciding to issue or not issue visitors' visas. Let us have fair and equal treatment.

* * *

TRANS-CANADA HIGHWAY

Mr. Bill Casey (Cumberland—Colchester): Madam Speaker, the new Government of Nova Scotia has announced that it will review the route for the new Trans-Canada Highway. I believe that the government is obligated to do this review as it campaigned on that promise and would be criticized if it did not follow through.

Having said that, I am very concerned about the people who are so very much affected by any change in this route. People's lives, homes, and businesses will all be destabilized during this review. As well, a lengthy delay would result in more tragic accidents on the present Trans-Canada Highway.

I urge that the new government consider all points of view from all the communities involved. I also urge the people who are affected to make their points of view known to the provincial department of transport.

I trust that we can take the politics out of this decision and choose the best route for all Nova Scotians. I pledge to do all I can to work with the new government to help resolve the issue.

SMALL BUSINESS LOANS

Mrs. Diane Marleau (Sudbury): Madam Speaker, according to a government press release on small business: "Loans to small businesses in Canada will become more accessible as a result of the significant changes to the Small Businesses Loans Act".

A constituent of mine applied to a local bank for a loan under the program. The interest on the loan would have been about 7 per cent. He has long been known in Sudbury as a hard worker and for his dedication and commitment to his customers. He offered his personal home as collateral. However the bank in question turned him down.

• (1410)

Despite the bank's failure to help him he established his business by mortgaging his house. However he is paying an interest rate of 13.25 per cent, more than double what it should be costing him. That is unfair. Despite all of that his business is doing well and is already creating a number of jobs.

I want to make the point that the banks deal in a very heavy-handed way with small businesses. How many others have the banks turned down across this country? How many others have not established their businesses? How many jobs have not been created?

Madam Deputy Speaker: I regret that the member's time has expired.

* * *

HEALTH

Ms. Dawn Black (New Westminster—Burnaby): Madam Speaker, access to abortion services remains uneven across the country.

Fourteen hundred abortions are performed on Canadian women in American border states because of lack of access in parts of Canada. Women in the Atlantic provinces, the north and those outside urban centres spend a great deal of money and time to travel for this simple medical procedure.

When they do reach a clinic they are often forced to walk through a barrage of picketers who harass them. While they were in power both the Liberals and Conservatives significantly cut funds for family planning education, thus increasing the need for abortion.

I ask the health minister to make RU-486 available in Canada, as it is in the U.S., and for the government to reverse its policies of economic and social inequality which rob many women of the choice to have children and of the right not to have children.

* * *

POVERTY

Hon. Alan Redway (Don Valley East): Madam Speaker, a United Nations committee has criticized Canada for not dealing with domestic poverty.

The UN has also criticized Canada for not spending enough on foreign aid to fight poverty in the Third World. The UN High Commissioner for Refugees has criticized Canada for not accepting more poor refugees, especially severely disabled refugees.

Another UN agency, the International Monetary Fund, has criticized Canada for not reducing our deficit and our debt fast enough. We might find some of the necessary resources in our defence budget but the UN Security Council keeps asking Canada to provide more of our military and its equipment for UN peacekeeping forces.

If we are going to address all of these very laudable concerns in the short run, we certainly have our work cut out for us.

* * *

PATRONAGE

Mr. John Harvard (Winnipeg—St. James): Madam Speaker, the endless parade of patronage and sleaze continues.

We have seen the baby-sitter get an appointment. We have seen the barman get an appointment. We have seen the barber get an appointment. Even the barber's wife got a little gift from the Mulroney-Charest-Campbell cabinet.

Now we hear that former Tory MP Jim McGrath has received a plum patronage posting. McGrath has been given a three-year appointment to the National Transportation Agency.

The Canadian people are sick and tired of this kind of sleaze and nepotism. They are sick to death of the old ways of the Conservative Party.

The Prime Minister may like to think that he is protecting the defence and environment ministers from the inevitable backlash. However that will not happen. These Order in Council appointments were made by the Governor in Council, meaning the cabinet.

The defence and environment ministers are part of that cabinet. They said yes to patronage for Tory flacks, hacks and bagmen. However on election day Canadians will be saying a loud no to them.

* * *

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL ACCESS AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. Vincent Della Noce (Laval–Est): Madam Speaker, from May 31 to June 6, Canadians all across the country will celebrate National Access Awareness Week, which promotes a fundamental value of our society: equal opportunity for all citizens. Based on community participation and partnership among the disabled and various sectors of activity, this national week is meant to be a special opportunity to emphasize the active participation of the disabled in the life of our society.

In Canada, tangible progress has been made in the quality of life and social and economic integration of the disabled, but much still remains to be done. Today I call upon my colleagues to take an active part in National Access Awareness Week and thus to promote the full and complete integration of the disabled in Canadian society. Access is more than a wish; it is a right for 4.2 million disabled Canadians.

* * *

[*English*]

SHOWBOAT

Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—St. Clair): Madam Speaker, the musical *Showboat* is a period piece which depicts blacks in the minstrel show tradition.

A new, supposedly updated, production in North York has evoked heated controversy and division among black and Jewish communities in spite of claims that Afro-Canadians' sensitivities are being addressed.

In Toronto to deliver a lecture named after Garth Drabinsky, the show's producer, William F. Buckley entered the dispute. He said that Jews have a right to be sensitive because of the Holocaust, and he is right. But according to him blacks who suffered over 200 years of slavery, 25 million dead in the Atlantic crossing, 100 years of second class citizenship, lynchings and showboat stereotypes are described as preposterous to express their sensitivity.

• (1415)

What could be more destructive to an historic alliance between two communities, both of which have suffered, than this racist trivialization of the sufferings of one by comparison to the other?

If the voices of the Buckleys are the price for *Showboat*, Mr. Drabinsky, it is not worth it.

* * *

DIRECT AIR LINKS

Mrs. Beryl Gaffney (Nepean): Madam Speaker, in the nation's capital we have the Ottawa Lynx baseball club, the Ottawa Senators hockey club, an advanced technology sector and many industries with a large market to the south. Yet we have a government and a transportation minister that are incapable of approving a direct air link from Ottawa to the American market, and in particular, Pittsburgh and Chicago.

Ottawa was the only city in Canada excluded from the original Canada–U.S. air treaty in 1974. As someone said recently, the Minister of Transport should crawl out from under this desk.

Yesterday we heard this same minister has awarded direct air service from his hometown to Pittsburgh. I say shame on him.

The lack of air links is costing the Ottawa region $500 million annually. People from Ottawa and its environs have no choice but to throw this government and this minister out of office in the next election.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*Translation*]

TRADE

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Acting Prime Minister. This morning in Washington, the Prime Minister met President Clinton and, after lunch, the Prime Minister said that he did not agree with the President of the

United States on sanctions to strengthen the parallel accords.

If the Canadian government does not agree with the President of the United States on the kind of sanctions proposed to solve the problems, could the minister tell us what other sanctions will be put forward or what other sanctions the government is proposing, so that when we have agreements, there will be penalties for those who break them?

[*English*]

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, I think the point the Prime Minister was making was a point that the Minister for International Trade has made on several occasions. The trade deal is the trade deal.

Now the question on a parallel accord respecting the environment and labour codes should have mechanisms for ensuring compliance and so on, but those mechanisms should not effectively undermine the accomplishments of the trade deal.

The Americans have put a position on the table, negotiations are going on and we will see where those negotiations end up. Canada's position is very clear. We do not want to undermine the benefits of the trade deal by adopting inappropriate conclusions on the parallel accord.

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Speaker, it is not a very convincing argument put forward by the minister.

We would like to know the position of the government at the negotiations at this time. If we need to have some rules governing the environment and the labour conditions, we would like to know exactly what kind of penalties this government is proposing to make sure that every one of the partners will respect the conditions agreed upon.

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, those are under active consideration and active discussion.

There is a whole myriad of ways in which we can achieve compliance and have dispute resolving mechanisms and so on. Our position is simply that whatever we do on the parallel accord side should not have the effect of undermining the benefits of the free trade agreement and that remains our position.

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Speaker, the hon. member talks about myriad solutions, but why can the government not pick one of them and tell us what it is? It does not have a myriad; it does not have one.

We would like to know because it is very important. The President of the United States said that the Americans will not proceed with the NAFTA deal if they do not have an agreement on the environment and labour conditions.

I would like to know from the minister the position of this government in the light of the sanctions proposed by the American government.

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, I am sure the hon. member would think we were not very responsible if we were negotiating in public in terms of Canada's position.

• (1420)

I would remind the hon. member that we have a whole range of international agreements, including agreements with the United States, bilateral agreements on acid rain, on Great Lakes clean–up and so on, all of which have in them performance criteria and all of which have what was viewed at the time as sufficient teeth to ensure compliance by both sides.

That is the kind of thing we are looking at rather than something that interferes with benefits of the trading arrangements.

* * *

BOSNIA

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre): Madam Speaker, in the absence of the minister of external affairs and the minister of defence, I will put my question to the Acting Prime Minister.

Members of my caucus have asked me to express on their behalf and on behalf of their constituents the sense of outrage that we feel about the continuing slaughter that is going on in Bosnia and the indifference of the United Nations and the member states to the horrible conditions there.

The Prime Minister after his meeting with the President of the United States this morning said that new action in Bosnia must be authorized by a new Security Council resolution.

There is a Security Council resolution being considered by the Security Council this afternoon. It reads: "UN troops will be authorized to take necessary measures, including the use of force, to stop attacks against civilians".

I ask the government: Does Canada support this resolution?

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, first of all I want to say that everybody on this side of the House and indeed all reasonable Canadians are outraged at what is going on in the former Yugoslavia and the atrocities being committed where innocent civilians and women and children are the victims.

The hon. member is correct. The discussions are under way at the Security Council. The Prime Minister discussed the subject extensively with President Clinton this morning. He made it very clear that he felt the United States should be actively engaged along with the European allies in seeking to find a solution.

We have always taken the position that UN action is required. We are concerned about unilateral action. We are concerned about adopting a resolution that is implementable because the safety and security of our troops are first and foremost.

Since the Security Council has not yet reached a conclusion on these particular discussions, it would be a bit premature for us to be making a judgment on them.

We can be sure that Canada is inputting. The Prime Minister through the President and the Secretary of State for External Affairs spent 45 minutes talking to the foreign affairs minister for Russia. We are doing everything we can on the diplomatic front.

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre): Madam Speaker, I am sure that all these discussions are taking place, but what has not taken place is a clear articulation of the Canadian position on this important resolution. That is missing.

Members of Parliament and their constituents would like to know. When we have UN relief workers being shot at, when we have troops standing by while genocide takes place, while we have the whole situation deteriorate into a mess, we believe that Canada because of our background and our reputation has the responsibility to take a stand on these issues.

I ask the minister again: Are we going to support the resolution being debated this afternoon at the Security Council authorizing UN troops in Bosnia to take action to stop attacks against civilians and to stop the slaughter?

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, I am a little confused by the hon. member's argument because he says that Canada should take a position quite independent of any position anybody else takes.

Of course, he realizes that if every country did this, no resolution would be possible. We can only find resolution by working together in discussion. As he points out, the UN now has it actively under discussion. I would be very surprised if Canada did not agree with the final resolution.

The final resolution has not been adopted. We stated our position quite emphatically. We believe it must be united action. We believe that unilateral action of the kind that was earlier proposed by the Clinton administration would not work. We believe that it is unrealistic to propose military action to which our troops could not possibly respond because of the numbers and equipment and the terrain in Yugoslavia and so on. All of those are being factored in. The discussions are under way. Canada as usual is being sought out for advice. We are looking for a consensus. We are not standing in isolation adopting our own position for the rest of the world to accept or reject.

* * *

• (1425)

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—St. Clair): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister for Science.

The other day the president of the National Research Council appeared before the parliamentary committee on industry, science and technology. He warned that if the present pattern of budget cutbacks continues at NRC

that NRC would experience once more the crisis it experienced in 1990–91 with cutbacks in personnel, cutbacks in research programs and a complete demoralization of the scientific staff there.

My question to the minister is as follows. What kind of research and development policy is it that would decimate one of our most prestigious research institutions and will he indicate to this House that the government will embark on a plan to ensure that the crisis the president of NRC predicts will not happen?

Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister for Science and Minister of State (Small Businesses and Tourism)): Madam Speaker, my hon. friend is taking licence with what the head of the NRC said the other day. He did not use the word decimate. He did not use any of the verbs the hon. member has just used. This government has cut back grants and contributions and cross-government programs 10 per cent here, 15 per cent there, sometimes even more in some operating programs.

When it comes to science those levels of cutbacks have not happened. In fact the cutbacks have not occurred. We are going to have more than zero per cent growth in contributions. They are going to be 1.5 per cent in the coming year.

This shows there is a preference in this government for helping research and development, for helping science and technology, plus the IRAP announcement which is an important part of the National Research Council.

Eighty-three million new dollars will go to the NRC to administer the IRAP for the next five years. This is an immense increase. Instead of having 225 officers in the field bringing discoveries in the laboratory to industry and to commercial prospect we will now have 300.

These are things the government has done in a time of restraint. They underline far better than any rhetoric the commitment of the government to science and technology.

Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—St. Clair): Madam Speaker, every time I ask this minister a question about any particular issue on science, he just shops through the market to find anything he can find without answering the question.

The fact of the matter is the president of the National Research Council said that the situation in 1990–91 would be repeated if there is not change and that was a crisis.

The next question I want to ask is a supplementary for the same minister. In view of the fact that the parliamentary committee also praised the National Centres of Excellence Program, proposed that it be continued and that its funding be increased, we now hear from a variety of sources that there are plans to cut the funding from $250 million to $125 million.

I would like the minister to explain how the government can justify cutting by half the funding for a program that represents the most significant and successful new initiative by this government.

Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister for Science and Minister of State (Small Businesses and Tourism)): I thank my hon. friend for the compliment because when we brought in the National Centres of Excellence, his party and he in particular fought the program. They said it would be better to give the money to the granting councils and let them decide where this money should go.

Instead we said something very creative. We said that we want to identify the 15 most excellent research opportunities in Canada, link them up with industry, build these centres and make them strong. We put that program in place beginning in 1989 and it is now under review. The parliamentary committee has complimented it and feels the program is working well. It thinks some changes should be made.

We are doing a peer review as well. These are the people who are the real scientists in the field. People in industry are doing their review of this program. The Prime Minister is committed to this program which will remain permanent. Whether we can maintain the same level of funding or not is a difficult question. Government is having to cut back. We are inviting the provinces to participate more than they are. We are inviting industry to participate more than it is. We will soon see what the level of funding will be.

• (1430)

Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—St. Clair): Madam Speaker, the hon. minister comes rather late to his expertise in science. I hope he will not again repeat the unmitigated falsehood that this member opposed the National Centres of Excellence Program. I did not.

Mr. Oberle: Yes, you did.

Mr. McCurdy: Give me the proof. My next question is for the same minister.

In view of the yet undenied cutbacks in the national Centres of Excellence funding and in view of the projected cutbacks in NRC and the crisis that precipitates, are we to understand it is now government policy as suggested in its prosperity initiative report to de-emphasize research and development—and I am not so sure the minister knows what that is—in favour of the begging, borrowing and stealing of technology from elsewhere?

Most people, most scientists he may eventually meet, would see it as a prescription for the destruction of our capability to advance in technology or anywhere else involving science.

Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister for Science and Minister of State (Small Businesses and Tourism)): Madam Speaker, my hon. friend knows, but he does not want the House to be reminded of it, that this government in its stewardship of the public purse has had to cut back a number of programs.

Certain programs have not been cut back at the same level as others. One is grants to provinces, to persons and to individuals. The other field is aboriginals. Another field of federal government spending that has not been cut back nearly as much is science and technology. Science and technology, if anything, has been indulged in the over-all priorities of this government and we are going to continue to do that.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

Ms. Albina Guarnieri (Mississauga East): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Acting Prime Minister.

Today Carleton University has once again reminded Canadians of the truth, that their government has mastered the politics of illusion. The authors of *How Ottawa Spends* reveal that this government's tangled web of technical trickery has silently robbed Canadian children and their families of more than $4 billion since 1986.

Will the minister explain how he expects to hide the darkest years for Canadian children with even more rhetoric of *Brighter Futures*?

Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Finance and Privatization)): Madam Speaker, I understand that publication was released. It is an interesting publication because it covers one-half of government operations.

It talks about spending. It does not talk about taxes and tax levels. It does not talk about income. It does not talk about the problems Canada has both provincially and federally with its deficits. It does not talk about the problems we have in the country.

I want to point out in no uncertain terms the changes that have happened in the social field over the last nine years. For example, old age security, GIS and SPA have gone from $11.4 billion to $20.2 billion. These are for senior citizens. There has been an average annual increase of 6.6 per cent over that period of time. Canada Pension Plan has gone from $4.2 billion to $14.6 billion, an increase annually of 14.8 per cent. Child benefits have gone from $3.9 billion to $5.1 billion, an average increase of 3 per cent each and every year over the last nine years.

I could go on and on. Maybe in answer to a supplementary question I could continue my list.

Ms. Albina Guarnieri (Mississauga East): Madam Speaker, it must be Groundhog Day again because the government cannot see its shameless shadow.

The government already wears the dunce cap in the G-7 when it comes to unemployment, but today we learned that our savagely high jobless rate masks the fact that 16 per cent of Canadian workers are looking for full-time jobs but cannot find them, leaving a record number to rely on part-time work.

Will the Minister of Employment and Immigration tell the over two million Canadians who cannot find full-time work why, when it comes to job creation, this government calls in sick?

Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Finance and Privatization)): Madam Speaker, I understand why the hon. member only asks one question every two weeks. It takes her that long to write it, obviously.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

• (1435)

Mr. McDermid: If she can be cute so can I.

Obviously those at the meeting of the OECD at the present time where a number of countries are represented, including Canada, are seized with the world-wide problems of unemployment and job creation. The problem is that at the same time they are wrestling with

debt and with very serious economic problems in all countries. It is something they are discussing.

It is unfortunate the employment end of things lags recovery. As recovery comes employment follows unfortunately later than recovery. Employment will improve over the next period of time, albeit not as fast as we all would like. It is not just a Canadian problem; it is a world-wide problem.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mark Assad (Gatineau—La Lièvre): Madam Speaker, my question was for the Minister of Finance, but since he is not available, I will direct it to the Acting Prime Minister or the Deputy Prime Minister.

One of the Conservative government's worst mistakes was its obsession with monetary policy, which worsened the economic situation, witness the 13.4 per cent unemployment rate in Quebec. The outlying regions are the most affected by business shutdowns, which lead to job losses.

When will the minister correct, improve or change his regional development policy in order to stem the flood of job losses? He could certainly do something.

[*English*]

Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Finance and Privatization)): Madam Speaker, I might remind the hon. member—and I believe he was part of it—on Bill C-91 that was brought forward in the House to help with the job situation especially in the province of Quebec he voted against it. I want the record to show that. Any time we have tried to help the employment situation that hon. member has voted against it, and I want the record to show that. It is very important the people of Quebec understand that.

Second, the construction industry is one industry where we feel that jobs can be created. Housing affordability today is as good as it has been in 25 years. We have also brought in programs to assure low down payments so young couples can buy their homes. We have lower interest rates which have to do with the fight the government has put on to assure that we get lower interest rates and lower inflation so savings are not eaten away and for the creation of jobs. We have assured that RRSPs are used for housing.

We have done a number of things to improve the situation. If the hon. member took time to study the reports that are coming out, he would know that Canada is poised to have the best record in 1993 and 1994 in recovering from the recession.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mark Assad (Gatineau—La Lièvre): Madam Speaker, I pity the audience which just heard his answer, because it is far from the answer needed for the question I asked. While the minister gives all sorts of explanations that have nothing to do with the question, unemployment goes up and the hope of finding a job goes down. As students arrive on the labour market this summer, the problem will get even worse.

Madam Speaker, I repeat: When will the minister present a real economic recovery plan for the outlying regions which suffer more than all other parts of the country?

[*English*]

Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Finance and Privatization)): Madam Speaker, the employment situation is one that we are concerned about.

I am sure the hon. member would be pleased at seeing the reports that came out today. The one from Burns Fry Limited said its leading indicator of Canadian economic activity rose 3.1 per cent, its highest level since March 1990, and that the help wanted index which tends to be an early indicator of new hiring increased by 9.2 per cent in May, the largest increase we have seen in four years.

All the signals are very positive and we feel very confident that as this year progresses we will see improved employment opportunities in Canada.

* * *

• (1440)

YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT

Mr. Ian Waddell (Port Moody—Coquitlam): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice. I see he is back from his campaigning and in his seat among his caucus.

As the minister is aware, we in the NDP believe that society should take tough measures against violent crime, but as a society we must balance this approach by

putting in place a program to prevent crime in the first place.

The minister is aware there was a meeting last week of the provincial attorneys general in Quebec City. I understand they recommended not only a review of the Young Offenders Act but a process that would bring communities together for a discussion of the whole juvenile justice system.

Did the minister receive recommendations from the meeting of the attorneys general? If so, what was his response to them?

Hon. Pierre Blais (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister of State (Agriculture)): Madam Speaker, at this meeting last Friday I mentioned to my provincial counterparts that we were contemplating different amendments to improve the Young Offenders Act.

Obviously with the time we have before us it would be very difficult to table legislation. However they agree. I suggested that maybe we could table a proposal, a white paper or something similar. I am contemplating this possibility to ensure that Canadians will be capable of making their point and being part of the consultation process. I will make a final decision in a very short time.

Mr. Ian Waddell (Port Moody—Coquitlam): Madam Speaker, the minister will know that I rose in the House a month ago and put before him a resolution from the village of Belcarra in my riding of Port Moody—Coquitlam. They called for a public review of the youth justice system, not just a bill but a public review of the youth justice system.

At that time 400 municipalities in Canada had agreed to it. There are 12 more in British Columbia, bringing the total to about 136. There are another 400. Now there are 536 municipalities and the provincial people.

I call upon the minister on behalf of our party to show some leadership on the national level and hold a national, non-partisan inquiry into the youth justice system. Why not announce that now before the end of this Parliament?

Hon. Pierre Blais (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister of State (Agriculture)): Madam Speaker, my hon. colleague knows that at this very moment in committee I think we have eight justice bills being looked at by parliamentarians here and in the other place.

The proceeds from crime bill will be here in a couple of days. We have the stalking legislation on which some of the member's colleagues are working on a daily basis. We also have the child pornography legislation. We have taken a lot of major steps in the protection of society.

I understand what my colleague is saying about the Young Offenders Act. I think we amended the Young Offenders Act last year. I will make public in a few days what are the intentions of the government in this area. I share with my colleague that this is an ongoing concern in the population and we will address it.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mrs. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of State for the Environment.

Yesterday environmental groups gave the Minister of the Environment failing grades for breaking the environmental promises made at the earth summit just one year ago. It is a miserable record: no sign of the law to guarantee the safety of Canadian drinking water, no legislation to prohibit the wholesale export of Canadian water, no national plan to freeze greenhouse gas emissions, no action to protect old growth forests and constant cuts to green plan funds.

When will the minister get back to his desk and campaign for his first responsibility, the environment?

Hon. Mary Collins (Minister of Western Economic Diversification and Minister of State (Environment) and Minister Responsible for the Status of Women): Madam Speaker, I am really glad my hon. colleague raised that question.

The report the Sierra Club provided was interesting. I actually felt that it really had not done its homework. I do not think it attended the meeting on Monday when our Canadian ambassador for environment and sustainable development, Mr. Campeau, brought out the report card on what we have done on the UNCED follow-up.

• (1445)

We have met our commitments. We are the first industrialized country to ratify the climate change convention and the biodiversity convention. We are already implementing both of those and we are developing national plans. We have been the lead in the development of the United Nations Conference on High Seas Fisheries, a very critical component.

One of the most important things which is often forgotten is that the Minister of the Environment, concerned about the dynamics of the UNCED follow-up, convened a meeting in April bringing together 12 of the environment ministers from around the world representing most of the industrialized countries. From that he has created a real political push to ensure that the meeting of the UN Commission on Sustainable Development to be held in June will indeed be a success.

Mrs. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West): Madam Speaker, my supplementary question is for the same minister.

Lots of meetings, lots of press conferences, lots of words and not much action. When the environmental ambassador does what he is supposed to do, he paints a rosy picture of Canada's inaction.

The major piece of environmental legislation of this Parliament, the Environmental Assessment Act, was passed a full year ago and has still not been proclaimed. Now we know that other cabinet ministers are hacking away at the regulations that will put teeth into protecting the environment.

Will the minister please get back to his real job, fight off the ambush from his cabinet colleagues and make sure the Environmental Assessment Act gets proclaimed and not gutted?

Hon. Mary Collins (Minister of Western Economic Diversification and Minister of State (Environment) and Minister Responsible for the Status of Women): Madam Speaker, again I am sure my hon. colleague will remember that the bill came back from the Senate with a number of recommendations. It asked that they be implemented before the act was proclaimed.

One is the development of all the regulatory requirements. Doing things in the real way, the open and transparent way, we went through a major consultative process.

We have just received the report from that stakeholders group and we will be using that. We will be working with colleagues toward the ultimate proclamation of the act and the implementation of the regulations.

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Madam Speaker, my question is for the same minister.

A year ago at the United Nations Conference on the Environment and Development the Minister of the Environment and the government declared climate change a top priority.

Yesterday environmental groups released a report card giving the government and the minister a D as in dismal on the follow-up to climate change.

Can the minister tell us when Canada will release its detailed national action plan to stop global climate change and explain the delay?

Hon. Mary Collins (Minister of Western Economic Diversification and Minister of State (Environment) and Minister Responsible for the Status of Women): Madam Speaker, again perhaps those who prepared the report overlooked some of the tremendous number of activities that we have taken in the past year with respect to the climate change convention.

Not only were we the first country to ratify it but we will also have this month the publication of our first national report on climate change which has come about as a result of multisectoral discussion.

In fact I attended the recent meeting of environment ministers. We are now working with the energy ministers for a plan this fall to ensure that we are working together to achieve our objectives federally and provincially.

Just think of some of the other things we have done: the tree planting program, the energy efficiency program—

Madam Deputy Speaker: I think we are getting into a speech. The hon. minister may have the possibility to continue on a supplementary.

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Madam Speaker, I can see that the level of rhetoric is pretty high on the government side but it is not backed up by action.

At the same conference in Rio the government also signed a biodiversity convention. However the government and the minister have failed to say one word on

probably the most important biodiversity issue in Canada.

Does the minister agree that Canada's ecological integrity and in particular that of the Pacific Rim National Park depend on the ecologically rich Clayoquot Sound forests or not?

Hon. Mary Collins (Minister of Western Economic Diversification and Minister of State (Environment) and Minister Responsible for the Status of Women): Madam Speaker again I am glad my colleague raised the question of the biodiversity convention.

Here Canada was in a leadership position. We were the first industrialized country to sign it and the first country to ratify it.

• (1450)

We are now working with a national biodiversity plan and with colleagues in the development of new national parks. Not long ago I signed the Haida Gwaii agreement. We recently announced the new park in the Yukon.

We are proceeding with every component of our biodiversity strategy, all those that are within—and I ask my hon. colleague to listen to this—within federal jurisdiction.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Hon. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton—Melville): My question is for the Acting Prime Minister.

A couple of days ago the Minister of Finance met with his provincial counterparts here in Ottawa to discuss the problems of the economy. The provincial ministers made it clear that they have done what they can to keep the deficit in check at the provincial level. They now want help from the federal government on the monetary side in terms of interest rates.

I want to ask a question in light of statements made by the Quebec finance minister, Mr. Levesque, and the Ontario treasurer, Mr. Laughren, and in light of the fact that the government has had a high interest rate policy for a number of years which has helped ruin the economy. Will the minister now use his authority with the Bank of Canada to lower interest rates further in this country in order to help stimulate the economy and create jobs for all Canadians?

Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Finance and Privatization)): Madam Speaker, I think that points out more poignantly than any other words could why the NDP will never ever form a national government in this country.

Those interest rates are not dictated by the government and the hon. member has been around here long enough to know that. If he is truly interested in finding out how things work, he should go to committee this afternoon and hear John Crow, the Governor of the Bank of Canada.

Hon. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton—Melville): Madam Speaker, the minister of finance in Quebec has asked the federal government to intervene. The treasurer of Ontario has asked for the same thing. Other provincial ministers have done the same thing.

Why does the government not use its authority and ask the Bank of Canada to lower interest rates in this country?

It was recently pointed out that the real interest rate in the United States federal reserve is some zero per cent; in Canada the real interest rate is about 4 per cent. Why does the government not intervene to reduce the gap between real interest rates in our country and the United States which would create jobs in Canada?

Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Finance and Privatization)): Madam Speaker, again the hon. member is way off base. I was at those meetings of finance ministers and I did not hear the finance minister of Quebec or the treasurer of Ontario ask the government to intervene. I did not hear them ask that.

I did hear them say that we have debt and deficit problems. We do not have that under control yet. They all admitted that and that they have to continue to fight that. They also indicated they wanted to see growth and job creation in this country, as we all do and they believe we are on the right track to that.

However, neither of those individuals requested direct intervention in the Bank of Canada by the Government of Canada. Therefore, the hon. member is totally wrong in his question.

GOVERNMENT APPOINTMENTS

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Acting Prime Minister.

On four separate occasions in recent days my colleagues and I have raised the issue of Mr. Arni Thorsteinson's appointment to the board of directors of the Bank of Canada 16 days after his companies defaulted on mortgages, making Canadians liable for up to $6 million worth of debt.

Why did the government neglect to tell us that Arni Thorsteinson was moonlighting as the president and chairman of another Crown corporation, Petro-Canada Limited? What is he going to do about it?

Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Finance and Privatization)): Madam Speaker, Mr. Thorsteinson was on the former board of directors of Petro-Canada. When Petro-Canada was privatized Petro-Canada Inc. held the responsibility of managing the debt of Petro-Canada and to make sure that the debt was erased. He has done an excellent job and as a matter of fact paid a dividend cheque from defeasance fees to the Government of Canada for their accounts over the last year.

For the hon. member to stand up here and make that silly accusation is totally unparliamentary and unbecoming of him as a member of this House.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Madam Speaker, that sounds like the comments the Prime Minister made last week, two days after another minister said that we were right in asking the questions and quite right in asking for the person's resignation.

• (1455)

Yesterday the Minister of Public Works said in response to a question: "After all, the opposition quite properly pointed out some difficulties. Upon consideration of them, it does appear that it is not appropriate for Mr. Thorsteinson to continue with this appointment".

I want to ask the minister if it was so inappropriate for this person to hold public office yesterday, why is it so appropriate today?

Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Finance and Privatization)): Madam Speaker, Mr. Thorsteinson has been in this job for some time and has done a good job. The job at Petro-Canada Inc. is winding up and therefore I have no regrets whatsoever that Mr. Thorsteinson ran Petro-Canada Inc. He did an excellent job and his record speaks for itself.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Hon. William Rompkey (Labrador): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Acting Prime Minister.

In May I raised a question with him about an expenditure of $43,000 for the Somali board of inquiry which will last 90 days. I was wrong. The cost of the inquiry is more like $225,000 including furniture, computer equipment and renovations.

When there is empty office space in this town and computers not in use, how can the government justify spending $225,000 on an inquiry that lasts 90 days?

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, the hon. member was correct when he said he was wrong.

He said that the commission spent $43,000 buying furniture. Wrong. The furniture was valued at $43,000 and they have rented it for the duration of the inquiry.

He said that computer equipment has been bought. He is partially right. The computer equipment is something DND has had in its acquisition program. It has been purchased, will be used by the inquiry and then will become part of DND's inventory to look after its needs.

Every step of the way, care is being taken by the commission and by DND to ensure the inquiry is done in the most cost-efficient manner possible. I think the hon. member should give credit to the integrity of the people involved. He should recognize they appreciate it is the taxpayers' money and they are acting responsibly.

Hon. William Rompkey (Labrador): Madam Speaker, I appreciate that it is taxpayers' money and I appreciate that care should be taken to control the expenditure involved. Bearing that in mind let me ask the minister:

Why was the $150,000 awarded without any tender at all? Why was that done?

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, I am not sure what contract he is talking about.

An hon. member: The computers.

Mr. Andre: The hon. member should allow me to answer because in fact what happens in respect to computers, given the government's requirements and needs for many of these, a broad general request for proposal is made to the suppliers. Based on the economics and the best deal possible, an agreement is signed that the government will purchase from that supplier the computers as they are needed.

In fact a competition, a tender if you will, was held but it was for the broad general purchase of these. As I say, DND requires them and has purchased them. DND is allowing the inquiry to use them and they will then become part of DND's stock as something that is needed. They are not a special purchase and it was not contrary to Treasury Board guidelines.

* * *

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina—Qu'Appelle): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Communications.

I have a letter dated May 21, 1993 from the president of the CBC, Mr. Gérard Veilleux, to the minister. In the letter the president stated that the budget cuts to the CBC announced in the April budget would "jeopardize our ability to meet our mandate".

I also have a letter sent by Mr. Paul Racine, assistant deputy minister, communications, to Mr. Tony Manera, senior vice-president of the CBC. This letter shows that the Department of Communications is preparing to set up an in-house task force of bureaucrats to review and cut back the CBC's mandate and services.

My question to the minister is—

• (1500)

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I think it would only be fair for the Speaker to hear what is being said without screams from both sides of the House.

Mr. de Jong: Madam Speaker, thank you for reminding some hon. members about proper decorum in the House.

Will the minister refer the question of the CBC's mandate and finances to the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture where it can be studied in an open and participatory forum rather than by a closed door committee of bureaucrats?

Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of Communications): Madam Speaker, I am a bit surprised at this question. The hon. member is a member of parliamentary committees. He knows that the parliamentary committees are masters of their own fate and can look into any matter whatsoever within their mandate.

Certainly any time that annual reports are produced, any time that estimates are produced, Parliament can at least have the scope to look at anything it wishes to look at.

If he asks me if it is more difficult for the CBC to meet its mandate under a period of restraint, or course it is. If he is asking if the mandate of the CBC is under review, of course it is. He is well aware of the fact that the CBC itself is undertaking a review of its mandate and taking a look at a whole repositioning exercise, that he should be well aware of, to ensure that the public broadcaster is able to discharge its responsibilities in serving Canadians.

The hon. member will also be well aware of the fact that the Canadian taxpayers are providing a subsidy of over $1 billion a year to the CBC to assist it in doing that.

* * *

[*Translation*]

COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Communications. Bell Canada has indicated to the

CRTC that it intends to go ahead with a new 911 emergency calls service. This service will be a slightly improved version of the former emergency calls system. However, the new service will be far more expensive.

For instance, for the Montreal Urban Community, the cost per line per month would be 47 cents, including taxes, instead of the present rate of 9 cents. This 500 per cent increase would mean an additional expense of $5 million for the MUC alone.

In Quebec, the new rates would be at least 35 per cent higher than those in Ontario, while a dedicated emergency calls service would exist only in Ontario. My question is this: does cost-effective federalism mean a 500 per cent increase for taxpayers in the Montreal area, rates that are 35 per cent higher in Quebec than in Ontario, not to mention the services which will be unavailable to us?

[*English*]

Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of Communications): Madam Speaker, as the hon. member is well aware, as he indicated himself, the proposals that were made by Bell Canada were made to the CRTC. It is the CRTC which has the responsibility of doing that.

For him to suggest that there is somehow an unfairness here and for him to try to feed on fears of interprovincial rivalry of one sort or another is very unfair. He should be well aware of the fact that at the present time there is a significant subsidy going the other way across the border between Ontario and Quebec. For him to suggest that somehow Quebecers would be better served by breaking up Confederation, he certainly misleads Quebecers in suggesting anything of the sort.

* * *

HEALTH

Mr. J. W. Bud Bird (Fredericton—York—Sunbury): Madam Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Health and Welfare or his parliamentary secretary.

The provincial government in New Brunswick has recently introduced a new provision with respect to medicare services when citizens are outside of Canada for more than 90 days. After that time, medicare payments will not be applicable for services obtained outside the country. Citizens have been advised to take out private health insurance coverage for such contingencies.

As well, the New Brunswick government has reminded residents that medicare coverage could lapse for citizens who are outside the province or the country for more than 182 days.

My question is whether or not the principle of modification of medicare coverage touching on absence from the province as I have just expressed is consistent with extra billing and user fees as have been previously found inconsistent with the Canada Health Act? Are these provisions with respect to temporary absence legitimate under the health act?

Madam Deputy Speaker: I think the question has been put. We are getting into a speech. The hon. parliamentary secretary.

Mrs. Barbara Sparrow (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Madam Speaker, the Canada Health Care Act requires each province to insure its residents for necessary health services.

It also has five criteria that are set down. When you are dealing with the authority of residency within a province, each province has the jurisdiction within that area. Some provinces have six months but I do see that New Brunswick, Quebec and Ontario are looking at three-month periods and that is within their jurisdiction. Do not conflict that with user fees.

* * *

• (1505)

PRIVILEGE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HEALTH ISSUES—SPEAKER'S RULING

Madam Deputy Speaker: I am now prepared to rule on a question of privilege relating to the alleged premature disclosure to the media of the sixth report of the Standing Committee on Health and Welfare, Social Affairs, Seniors and the Status of Women, a report concerning the blood transfusion system in Canada.

I will first attempt to summarize the events which have led to today's ruling. On Tuesday, May 25, the hon. member for Delta, who also chairs the subcommittee on health issues, raised a question of privilege concerning the apparent leak of his subcommittee's draft report. The hon. member for Delta expressed his concern about the report's effect being damaged by a premature re-

lease. This matter was pursued further by the hon. member for Winnipeg North who demanded an apology from the hon. member for Don Valley North for having accused him of releasing the report. The hon. member for Don Valley North subsequently offered an apology and also asked that the Chair investigate this matter; she further intimated that the list of persons who could have released the report was very short and in doing so, made specific reference to the hon. member for Halifax. The next day, May 26, the hon. member for Halifax rose on a question of privilege to request that the hon. member for Don Valley North rectify the unfortunate impression left by her statement of May 25. The hon. member for Don Valley North responded that no specific inference was intended and she reiterated her request for an investigation of the alleged leak.

In this ruling, I will deal with what I believe to be the two components at issue here: firstly, the breach of privilege resulting from the premature disclosure of a committee report and secondly, the very serious nature of conclusions arrived at and expressed during these interventions.

As members are aware, committee work must not be impeded by lack of trust or integrity. Over the years, there have been quite a number of cases brought to the attention of the Chair where alleged leaks of confidential committee information had taken place. In order to summarize the practice which has evolved in such cases, allow me to refer to a case which took place in 1987.

[*Translation*]

In 1987, the hon. member for Kenora—Rainy River disclosed the content of some proceedings of the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development which was sitting *in camera*. Later on, the matter was brought before the House through the report submitted by that committee. On the same day, a question of privilege was raised by the hon. member for Selkirk—Interlake. The Chair held that the question was sufficiently serious to ask the House to give its opinion on the matter. The House then referred the matter to the Standing Committee on Elections, Privileges and Procedure, which concluded that the conduct of the member was contrary to the usage and practice of the House. Some time thereafter, the hon. member for Kenora—Rainy River apologized to the House.

[*English*]

In keeping with our practices, it is therefore essential that the committee itself first review the situation and look at all aspects of the concerns raised by the hon. members. If it sees fit, the committee may then report the matter to the House. In this way, if the Chair judges that a prima facie breach of privilege has occurred, then the hon. members of the House can decide whether the question should be referred to the Standing Committee on House Management for further consideration.

[*Translation*]

The premature release of committee reports hampers the continued work of committees and puts the trust that exists between committee members at risk. Our democratic system is based on the very principle of trust and such incidents can only undermine the parliamentary regime by which we are governed.

[*English*]

Finally, the second element at issue here is one that needs to be addressed with great prudence. The Chair need not remind all members that gratuitous inferences made at the expense of individuals in this Chamber or outside can have devastating repercussions, be they founded or not.

• (1510)

Personal accusations have no place in the House of Commons. Dignity must prevail at all times and it is my duty to uphold it in this place.

I want to thank all members for their patience and I am confident that members will demonstrate their usual good judgment and respect for one another in dealing with this matter.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Charles A. Langlois (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and to Minister of National Defence): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 11 petitions.

[*Editor's Note: see today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

[*English*]

BILL C-122

REPORT OF LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

Mr. Bill Attewell (Markham—Whitchurch—Stouffville): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the report of the legislative committee on Bill C-122, an act to amend the customs tariff, textile tariff reduction.

* * *

COMMUNICATIONS AND CULTURE

THIRD REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. J. W. Bud Bird (Fredericton—York—Sunbury): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the third report of the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture in relation to violence on television.

This report arises from two orders of reference from the House, one in November as a result of a petition presented to this House by Virginie Larivière of Quebec containing more than 1.3 million signatures expressing concerns about violence on television in Canada, and another on February 12, 1992 arising from a motion by the hon. member for Regina—Wascana calling for a review of media portrayal of violence in Canada, especially with respect to women and children, and seeking better ways to protect innocent Canadians while not unduly restricting freedom of expression.

In response to these two orders of reference our committee has made a series of recommendations. They call for voluntary regulation and control of television portrayal of violence by the broadcasting industry and individual Canadians, measures to empower Canadians with a wider selection of education information about media literacy with new technology to control television sets and channels, and a new national classification system for television programming and video films. All of this will help Canadians with a better quality of choice for television programs on behalf of themselves and their children.

I would particularly like to pay tribute to the hon. member for Outremont for his work in chairing the subcommittee that drafted this report.

[*Editor's Note: See today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

* * *

COPYRIGHT ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

Hon. Bob Kaplan (York Centre) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-442, an act to amend the Copyright Act.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 68(2), the motion is deemed adopted.

Mr. Kaplan: Madam Speaker, under the Canadian Copyright Act, which follows a British precedent several hundred years old, the copyright of documents which are issued by the government including statutes, for example, are the private property of the Crown. Anyone who copies them theoretically and legally is responsible to pay a royalty for them.

This is inconsistent with the practice in most other countries and the purpose of this proposed law is to abolish the Crown copyright and make public documents public property.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Mr. Kaplan moves that the bill be now read the first time and printed.

Pursuant to Standing Order 69(1), the motion is deemed adopted.

Bill read the first time and printed.

* * *

CANADA WATER EXPORT PROHIBITION ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-443, an act to prohibit the export of water by interbasin transfers.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 68(2), the motion is deemed adopted.

• (1515)

Mr. Riis: Madam Speaker, this bill has the enthusiastic support of the member for Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt and the member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley.

We have introduced it in response to 43,000 petitioners and after extensive public consultation. People are expressing their concern that our water, especially in the case of the North Thompson River, ought not to be for sale.

This act is necessary due to the government's failure to recognize that our water resources are in jeopardy due to its haste to ram the North American free trade agreement through Parliament. International resource management and international legal affairs experts have concluded that, because the government has failed to negotiate specific exclusions for the bulk export and transfer of water in both the free trade agreement with the United States and the North American free trade agreement with Mexico and the United States, water is a trade commodity as identified in these two agreements and under the GATT becomes a legitimate export commodity out of Canada into both the United States and Mexico.

Literally thousands and thousands of British Columbians, supported by people across the country, have indicated that they want this legislation passed before Parliament recesses to safeguard our freshwater rivers and lakes.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Mr. Riis moves that the bill be now read the first time and printed.

Pursuant to Standing Order 69(1), the motion is deemed adopted.

Bill read the first time and printed.

Mr. Riis: Point of order, Madam Speaker. There have not been consultations and I wonder if you would find there is unanimous consent in the House that this matter be referred to the appropriate standing committee as soon as possible.

May I seek that unanimous consent?

Madam Deputy Speaker: Does the hon. member have unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: No.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Obviously there is no unanimous consent to send this bill to committee at this time.

COMMUNICATIONS AND CULTURE

THIRD REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. J. W. Bud Bird (Fredericton—York—Sunbury): Madam Speaker, arising from the presentation a few moments ago of the report by the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture with respect to television violence I would like to present the following resolution:

> Whereas this House received a petition on November 18, 1992 from Ms. Virginie Larivière of St–Polycare, Quebec, containing 1.3 million signatures expressing serious concerns about violence on television in Canada and calling for government action to address the moderation of such violence; and
>
> Whereas such petition was referred to the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture for study and report which has been tabled in this House today;
>
> That this House, as one important measure to contribute to the over–all reduction of violence in Canadian society, calls on all Canadians to exercise their utmost influence in all reasonable ways to control and diminish the portrayal of violence on Canadian television screens; and
>
> That this House call for initiatives to be taken jointly by the federal and provincial governments and the industry to develop a universal film, video, and television program classification system for Canada.

Mr. David Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond): Madam Speaker, there has been some consultation with the Official Opposition, particularly the hon. member for Mount Royal, and the Official Opposition wishes to give its consent to this motion.

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops): Madam Speaker, there have been consultations. I must say on behalf of the New Democrat caucus that we enthusiastically support this resolution. As a matter of fact, we would like to see it go a lot further but this is a first step.

Mr. Alex Kindy (Calgary Northeast): Madam Speaker, I do support this initiative. It is an excellent one and I think the independents are certainly in favour of it.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint–Hubert): Madam Speaker, I want to say that we in the Bloc quebecois were also consulted and that we support this motion.

I may add that once again, we were only given the English version of the motion. I would appreciate it if from now on, we could have it in French as well.

Mr. Charles A. Langlois (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and to Minister of National Defence): Madam Speaker, about the document that was produced in English, I would like to explain to the hon. member that the document was prepared at the last minute and unfortunately, there was no time to have it translated. However, I promise to have it translated as soon as possible. Meanwhile, the government is delighted with this show of support and will make it unanimous.

• (1520)

Madam Deputy Speaker: The Chair concludes that the hon. member for Fredericton—York—Sunbury has the unanimous consent of the House to present his motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Bird: Madam Speaker, I believe the resolution was presented in both official languages.

[*Translation*]

Madam Deputy Speaker: A French version was laid on the Table, and I am sure we can get this copy to the hon. member for Saint-Hubert right away.

Mrs. Venne: Madam Speaker, when I said we gave our consent, it was for a motion that was available to me only in English. I know that according to the Standing Orders, motions are always tabled in French and English, but only the English version was available when I spoke.

[*English*]

Madam Deputy Speaker: We do have this motion in two versions. The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

PETITIONS

WATER DIVERSION

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops): Madam Speaker, once again it is an honour to present a petition on behalf of a large number of petitioners. There are now more than 43,000 individuals who are concerned about maintaining sovereignty over our fresh water.

The petitioners ask the Government of Canada to ensure that water is identified as an exempt category in the North American free trade agreement and in the FTA as well.

VIOLENCE

Mr. Jesse Flis (Parkdale—High Park): Madam Speaker, it is an honour for me, pursuant to Standing Order 36, to table the following petition signed by close to 500 residents of the greater Toronto area.

They wish to draw to the attention of the House the fact that incidents of crime involving violence are becoming more and more frequent, each incident of violence harms the public and there would be fewer such incidents if certain legislative measures were taken.

Therefore the petitioners call upon Parliament to enact legislation pertaining to all crimes involving violence that would result in much tougher sentencing, little or no parole and a decrease in the age limit of the Young Offenders Act.

It is fitting that I have the honour to table this petition at the same time that the television classification motion was just passed.

SERIAL KILLER BOARD GAME

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys): Madam Speaker, parents and grandparents in my riding are seeking a ban on the serial killer board game. The game comes with a body bag, 25 babies and 4 serial killer figures. The object is to commit murder and the person with the highest body count becomes the winner.

This game is not in the best interests of children and in the wrong hands could become dangerous and suggestive to easily impressionable young people.

I am from an area that just had three murders at a McDonald's restaurant in the very recent past. I ask the House to consider this and to urge the Government of Canada to ban the sales of the serial killer board game.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. Al Horning (Okanagan Centre): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to present four petitions with 118 names from Oscar Kleppe, John Semple, Angus Morrison and I.J. Dayton on behalf of a group of constituents of mine who humbly call upon Parliament to enact legislation which would allow a referendum of the people, binding upon Parliament, to accept or reject two official lan-

guages, English and French, for the government and the people of Canada.

CHRISTINE LAMONT AND DAVID SPENCER

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway): Madam Speaker, I have three petitions to present. My first petition is signed by hundreds of residents of British Columbia.

It notes that two young Canadians, Christine Lamont and David Spencer, who were sentenced to 28 years each in a Brazilian prison, have suffered grave miscarriages of justice. There have been a number of riots in the compounds in which they are held which threaten their health and safety. The only relief available for their punishment is to request expulsion.

Therefore, the petitioners call upon Parliament to urge the Prime Minister to request the Government of Brazil to expel Christine Lamont and David Spencer and return them to Canada in accordance with Brazilian law.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway): Madam Speaker, the second petition notes that in October 1985 the subcommittee on equality rights of the justice committee submitted a unanimous report to Parliament recommending that the Canadian Human Rights Act be amended to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation in all areas of federal jurisdiction.

• (1525)

The petitioners go on to note that despite repeated promises the government would act on this commitment and despite calls by the Canadian Human Rights Commission for the government to act on this commitment, no action has been taken.

Therefore the petitioners call upon Parliament to ensure the government acts to bring forward immediately an amendment to add sexual orientation to the Canadian Human Rights Act as a prohibited ground of discrimination.

NORTH AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway): Madam Speaker, I have a petition which is signed by hundreds of residents of the cities of Burnaby and Vancouver on the subject of the proposed North American free trade agreement.

This petition points out that NAFTA has resulted in even greater trade concessions being demanded of Canada. It refers to the problem of bringing on to the market generic drugs and points out that NAFTA cannot be remedied through renegotiation.

Therefore, the petitioners call on the House to reject the proposed North American free trade agreement and recommend to the government that it use the termination clause to end the Canada–U.S. Free Trade Agreement.

GORE BAY–MANITOULIN ISLAND AIRPORT

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present seven petitions today. They are signed by 225 people from throughout Manitoulin Island.

The petitioners express their concern that the government plans to automate the weather station at the Gore Bay–Manitoulin airport later this fall. They express concern that services to navigators and the general public will be sharply reduced by that automation.

I note the Minister of State for Transport is in the House today. We have been making representations to her. I am sure that these petitions will only reinforce those representations.

NORTH AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Madam Speaker, I have the honour as well this afternoon to present a petition signed by more than 100 constituents of the hon. member for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke who has been ill and in hospital. He is making a great recovery and has been back in the House at least once. He has asked me to present this petition on his behalf.

This petition deals with the impact of the planned North American free trade agreement. The petitioners are concerned about a loss of jobs, the impact on the environment and the impact on government independence.

I present these petitions on behalf of the member for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke.

YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT

Mr. Brian O'Kurley (Elk Island): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 I have the honour and the privilege to present a number of petitions today on three separate issues.

The first is related to the Young Offenders Act. There are a number of petitions including the names of over 2,000 people in the communities of Sherwood Park, Fort Saskatchewan, Bruderheim, Tofield, Nisku, Beaumont, Ardrossan and in and around the Edmonton area.

The petitioners call upon Parliament to strengthen the Young Offenders Act or replace it with legislation that will be a stronger deterrent to youth crime. They are most concerned with repeat violent young offenders and recommend harsher penalties, including work camps. In cases of dealing with theft or property damage they suggest financial repayment to the victims.

UKRAINIAN CANADIANS

Mr. Brian O'Kurley (Elk Island): Madam Speaker, my second petition deals with the acknowledgement and redress for injustices committed by the Government of Canada against Ukrainian pioneer settler communities during and following the First World War.

It includes the names of approximately three dozen petitioners from the Edmonton area. They call upon Parliament to give a succinct timetable for resolving this important redress issue.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. Brian O'Kurley (Elk Island): Madam Speaker, there are two final petitions. One is on behalf of Mr. Alec Saruk of Lamont who calls upon Parliament to provide for a referendum on the Official Languages Act.

This would allow a referendum that is binding on Parliament to accept or reject two official languages, English and French, for the government and the people of Canada. The second petition is from a number of people in the Edmonton area and it is with regard to the same issue.

• (1530)

UKRAINIAN CANADIANS

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Saskatoon—Humboldt): Madam Speaker, it is my honour and duty to present a petition on behalf of a number of constituents.

The Prime Minister indicated in October 1992 the intention of the government to settle the claim of redress to the mutual satisfaction of both the government and the Ukrainian community.

These petitioners call upon Parliament to urge the government to act on the unanimous motion of the House of Commons of September 27, 1991 and settle the acknowledgement and redress issue to the satisfaction of the Ukrainian Canadian community and the government.

TAXATION

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition on behalf of several petitioners.

They ask the government to review its tax regulations and laws, particularly as it affects parents who have special needs children. These parents are often directed by their family physicians to place them in special facilities that incur additional costs.

These parents feel, and I support their request, that there are often significant additional costs which they cannot deduct from their income. They want the government to review the situation.

[*Translation*]

I think that is an entirely legitimate request.

[*English*]

SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES RESEARCH COUNCIL

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, the second petition I have the honour to present is from petitioners who point out that our greater challenges in Canada are really our social problems. These problems include inequity, poverty, unemployment, et cetera.

They point out that we need strong social science research to determine the causes and propose solutions. They feel that the current arrangement of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council is an appropriate one.

They ask that this proposed merger be set aside and that the government study this question, consider the implications and then decide at some future date.

[*Translation*]

That is another legitimate request I support.

[*English*]

CHRISTINE LAMONT AND DAVID SPENCER

Mr. George S. Rideout (Moncton): Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce a petition under Standing Order 36 relating to two people who are in a Brazilian prison.

The petitioners call upon Parliament to urge the Prime Minister to request the Government of Brazil to expel Christine Lamont and David Spencer and return them to Canada in accordance with Brazilian law.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. George S. Rideout (Moncton): Madam Speaker, I have a second petition which it is my obligation to present. It concerns a referendum with regard to language.

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

Mr. Vic Althouse (Mackenzie): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present a number of petitions, mostly from farmers along the eastern side of Saskatchewan.

In their opinion the Canadian Wheat Board has played a vital role in the orderly marketing of Canadian wheat, barley and oats since its inception. They note that the Minister of Agriculture's proposal to remove barley from the jurisdiction of the Wheat Board is another step toward dismantling the board.

They call upon the government to keep barley under the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board and to actively support the marketing of other crops by the Canadian Wheat Board.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (Okanagan—Shuswap): Madam Speaker, I have a petition with regard to the introduction of competition in the long distance telephone market as well as the passage of Bill C-62 and the regulation that would take place under the provisions of that bill.

These petitioners are opposed to the disruptive effects of the introduction of long distance competition and the deregulatory effects of this bill.

They ask the Minister of Communications to engage in substantive consultations with all segments of Canadian society regarding the market impact of this deregulatory environment.

TRADE

Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (Okanagan—Shuswap): Madam Speaker, the second petition I have the honour to present is from petitioners who are concerned about the impact of the North American free trade agreement and the restrictions being placed upon Canada's federal, provincial and territorial governments now and in the future.

They ask the government to reject the proposed North American free trade agreement and recommend to the government that it use its termination clause to end the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (Okanagan—Shuswap): Madam Speaker, the final set of petitions I have the honour to present concerns the changes to the Unemployment Insurance Act.

These petitioners, from throughout British Columbia, are concerned about the impact of these changes. They call upon the House to reject the amendments made to the Unemployment Insurance Act, particularly with respect to the appeal process for employees and the difficulty that has caused with respect to dismissal.

• (1535)

CHRISTINE LAMONT AND DAVID SPENCER

Mr. Ian Waddell (Port Moody—Coquitlam): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition signed by 1,425 people from the lower mainland of British Columbia.

They point out to this House and the government that Christine Lamont, whose family lives in the area where the signatures come from, and David Spencer will be rotting in a Brazilian jail for 28 years.

They request the Canadian government ask for the expulsion of these two people to Canada to get them out of that jail, which it could do. This petition is from 1,425 people from Langley, Surrey, and Aldergrove, B.C.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Charles A. Langlois (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and to Minister of National Defence): Madam Speaker, question No. 524 will be answered today.

[*Text*]

Question No. 524—**Mr. Taylor:**

Does the government have employees in the riding of The Battlefords—Meadow Lake and, if so, (a) how many and what is their primary place of employment (b) are any positions designated as bilingual and, if so, (c) how many vacancies have occurred in both unilingual and bilingual positions and how many of those have been filled?

Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)): The government has 157 Public Service employees in the riding of The Battlefords-Meadow Lake. Four of these employees are in bilingual positions and 153 are in unilingual English positions. These employees are mainly located in Battleford, North Battleford and Meadow Lake.

In Public Service recruitment in Saskatchewan in 1992, the 36 new recruits were appointed to unilingual positions.

Madam Deputy Speaker: The question mentioned by the parliamentary secretary has been answered. Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

[*English*]

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Charles A. Langlois (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and to Minister of National Defence): Madam Speaker, I would ask that all notice of motions for the production of papers be allowed to stand.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Duhamel: Madam Speaker, on February 12, 1993 I gave notice of question No. 472, which reads as follows:

[*English*]

What is the total number of Aboriginal women employed in a legal capacity within (a) the Department of Justice (b) other federal departments (c) crown corporations and governmental agencies and (d) human rights commissions?

According to a Standing Order of this House the government is allowed 45 days to answer such a question. It has now gone beyond 100 days.

[*Translation*]

Now I am as reasonable and patient as the next person, but quite frankly, this is going a bit far.

[*English*]

I recall another such question that took 400 days. It was on the spending of GST revenues. I cannot wait that long. We are coming to the end of the session. I am becoming increasingly frustrated because these questions have been asked by constituents of mine and I cannot provide them with an answer. I want to do so and I want to do so in the immediate future.

Can I please have some assurance that these answers will be supplied to me within the next couple of days?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Langlois: Madam Speaker, I have made a note of the hon. member's concerns, and I will see to it that his question is answered as soon as possible; I hope within a matter of days.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Shall all notices of Motions for the Production of papers stand?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

SUPPLY

MAIN ESTIMATES 1993-94—VOTE 1

Madam Deputy Speaker: Today being the last allotted day in the supply period ending June 23, 1993, the House will, as usual, proceed to consideration of a motion to concur in a supply bill.

In accordance with recent practice is it agreed to have the bill distributed now?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Supply

[*English*]

Hon. Frank Oberle (for the President of the Treasury Board) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $65,974,000 under Treasury Board—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1994, (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

Mr. Bill Kempling (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)): Madam Speaker, I am honoured today to speak to the matter of full supply for the main estimates for the fiscal year 1993–94.

• (1540)

This year the main estimates total $161.1 billion. Through these estimates the government is seeking Parliament's approval for $48.9 billion in new spending authority. The remaining $112.2 billion represents statutory payments that have received previous parliamentary approval.

These main estimates, as well as those tabled in the previous eight years, reflect the government's commitment to eliminating waste and inefficiency, as well as divesting activities and organizations that no longer serve a vital public need in order to reduce costs and strike a proper balance between Canadians' demands for federal services and their ability as taxpayers to pay for them.

In this regard much has been achieved over the past eight years. Program spending has been held to 16.7 per cent of Canada's gross domestic product for the past two years as compared to 20 per cent in 1984.

Since 1984 the growth in program expenditures, including Public Service salaries, has averaged only 3.7 per cent per year as compared to an average inflation rate of 4 per cent per year. This translates into a net real decline of 2.6 per cent.

These achievements illustrate the government's commitment to increased efficiency through the rigorous control of expenditures as well as the implementation of many innovative management practices. This government has maintained and will continue to maintain careful stewardship over taxpayers' dollars. We are leaders in this area, as is demonstrated by our long record of success.

The year over year increase of .4 per cent in the main estimates is the outcome of an annual review of the requirements for all 137 programs delivered by 111 departments, agencies and Crown corporations appearing in the estimates. This increase can be divided into two broad categories: adjustments to statutory items, which amount to a net increase of $423 million or 74 per cent of the year over year growth, and changes to voted items, which amount to $149 million or 26 per cent of the year over year growth.

Statutory spending this year is $112.2 billion, or 70 per cent of the total estimates. Spending in this category includes such things as major federal transfers to Canadians in respect of old age security, guaranteed income supplement and unemployment insurance benefits; transfers to the provinces under equalization programs for health, education and social assistance; general Public Service programs; and public debt charges

Voted spending, approved annually by Parliament, amounts to $48.9 billion in these estimates. This reflects an increase of .3 per cent over last year. The major factor underlying the growth in the voted portion of the main estimates is the continuing requirements of items funded initially through the 1992–93 supplementary estimates.

Items approved through the 1992–93 supplementary estimates and included in the 1993–94 main estimates reflect the incorporation of new policy and workload increases announced or identified after tabling of the 1992–93 estimates. In addition, these Main Estimates include the additional costs of collective agreements as extended by the Public Sector Compensation Act.

On a consolidated basis the budgetary main estimates will increase by only .4 per cent for this upcoming year. Four main areas account for 82 per cent of the total allocated budgetary spending: public debt charges account for nearly 25 per cent; social programs for 38 per cent; fiscal arrangements for close to 12 per cent; and defence spending for 7.3 per cent.

Social programs are the largest component of over–all spending for 1993–94 with the federal government directing over $61 billion or, 38 per cent of its planned spending, in this area. The government will continue its efforts to ensure the health and well–being of all Canadians. Help is directed to those in greatest need through programs of assistance to the economically and

socially disadvantaged including the jobless, unskilled persons with disabilities, seniors and immigrants as well as aboriginal people, veterans and children.

• (1545)

The Departments of Employment and Immigration, National Health and Welfare, Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation and Veterans Affairs account for nearly 99 per cent of the spending in this sector. For 1993–94, program spending will amount to $120.9 billion with growth being kept at about a 1.7 per cent increase over last year.

This growth is due in large part to increased benefits being paid out under old age security, unemployment insurance, fiscal equalization and the Canada assistance programs. The remaining growth is the result of increased spending on aboriginal people and veterans, supplemental income support, payments to fishermen and plant workers in the northern cod fishery of Newfoundland and the investment in public infrastructure.

The spending programs for 1993 and 1994 are well within the limits set out in the spending control legislation that was approved by this House in 1992. The December economic and fiscal statement announced the government's intention to change the unemployment insurance program. As a result of the passage of Bill C–113, the government is expected to generate savings of $850 million in 1993–94 alone. However this bill was approved after the main estimates were tabled and therefore these savings are not reflected in the estimates of 1993–94.

The December statement also announced reduced funding for transportation subsidies, the Public Utilities Income Tax Transfer Act and grants in lieu of taxes to municipalities. These measures are expected to generate significant savings, however they cannot be included in the estimates as the changes to the statutory authorities had not been approved at the time of the tabling of the main estimates.

The recent budget measures announced by my colleague, the Minister of Finance, will see significant changes to the way in which government does business. Streamlining will become necessary in many areas of government and tough decisions will be made regarding the discontinuation of discretionary programs. We, as Canadians, can no longer afford some of these. Estimates tabled in the next few years will no doubt prove to be testimony to the positive impact resulting from this budget. We will be able to live within our means at that time.

Expenditure management has already forced departments and agencies to face increasing demands for their services with fewer available resources. Reductions in available moneys within the operations and maintenance budgets have been an element of the restraint measures announced in every budget since 1985. This has resulted in reductions to the purchasing power of operating and maintenance budgets of an ongoing program in the order of 30 per cent since 1985.

Canadians have expressed the desire for governments to spend less, spend smarter and be more efficient. Perhaps this feeling has never been stronger than at the present time. Tackling this country's deficit through spending cuts has become a number one priority of governments within Canada. Transfer payments continue to account for most of the growth in the main estimates. For this upcoming year transfer of payments will increase nearly $1.4 billion. Increasing costs in unemployment insurance, Established Program Financing, the Canada Assistance Plan, payments to provinces as well as transfers to seniors accounts account for nearly all the growth in this area.

In the 1993–94 estimates $42.6 billion, or 26 per cent of total budgetary expenditures is for transfers to persons. Of this $42.6 billion, unemployment insurance and transfers to seniors account for over $20 billion. The Minister of Finance announced a 10 per cent cut to transfer payments for selected programs in his December statement. Savings as a result of this initiative are expected to reach $779 million in 1993–94 with $644 million being reflected in these main estimates.

Cutbacks in government expenditures have not only originated from reducing transfer payments to individuals and provinces. The more severe reductions have been made in government operating expenditures.

• (1550)

Between 1992–93 and 1993–94 transfers to persons and provinces increased by 1.7 per cent whereas total capital operating expenditures by government departments will decrease by 0.8 per cent.

Notwithstanding the extent of recent government cutbacks, the Government of Canada remains committed to the green plan. Although a 10 per cent reduction in green plan funding was announced in accordance with the December economic statement, green plan funding increased by $64.7 million over the planned 1992–93 levels. Other changes to green plan funding levels in the estimates stem from the February 1992 budget which saw the reallocation of moneys for future years.

Expenditure control initiatives are not limited solely to placing fiscal restraints on current operations. We are also restructuring. As a result of the February 1992 budget close to 40 agencies have been wound up, merged or consolidated. It is estimated that $56.6 million will be saved in 1993–94 due to this rationalization.

The concept of cost recovery and user fees is becoming increasingly popular as a means of collecting government revenues to pay for services that benefit only a small portion of the population. At the same time such an initiative removes the obligation from taxpayers to involuntarily pay for services they do not use. With the pressure on this country to reduce its deficit primarily through lowering the government expenditures and not through tax increases, the government is placing the emphasis on supporting higher priority programs that benefit all Canadians.

By adopting user fees and cost recovery, the government is attempting to provide an improved service it might not otherwise be able to afford and ensures the best use is made of scarce resources. This will also foster a more service oriented market-based sensitivity in government as it becomes more attentive to its clients needs.

To assist departments with the implementation of user fees, several pieces of legislation have been introduced and approved by Parliament over the past few years. With this renewed interest, the amount of money received annually through user fees has doubled to well over $3 billion in the last eight years. It is expected that this trend for revenue generation will continue.

The initiatives I have outlined are only a sampling of the many initiatives the government is currently promoting. It is committed to reforms that will continue to assure a high quality of service to Canadians at a reasonable cost.

Finally the 1993–94 main estimates now before the House are representative of a government serious about restraint and reform in order to benefit all Canadians. Given our success to date I know we are on the right track. I am confident Canadians will welcome the changes we are initiating and considering for the future in the areas of cost reduction and enhanced program delivery.

These initiatives will be pursued in a manner that will allow us to organize and operate government programs to ensure continued prosperity for all Canadians.

Mr. Ian Waddell (Port Moody—Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a broad question with one specific. I do not expect the hon. member to be able to answer the specific but I will bring it forward anyway.

I wonder how serious the government really is in cutting fat and costs in terms of looking at things. It seems to me it cuts things that are embarrassing. It cut the Law Reform Commission, the Court Challenges Program and anything that could politically embarrass it and it says that is cutting the fat. It does not cut anything that is not embarrassing that is fat.

The hon. member said the government tried to cut back. In what serious way did it try to cut back? How did it seriously look at these programs?

I know the provincial governments are dealing with this. I know the minister of finance in British Columbia personally and I know the provincial treasurer in Ontario. They have had to go through department after department cutting back and looking at what was really essential and trying to preserve what really helped people.

• (1555)

I was looking through this briefly. There are billions and billions of dollars of expenditures. I see something called the Northern Pipeline Agency on which we spent $469,000. I know personally that the Northern Pipeline Agency was set up under a previous Liberal government in the 1970s to supervise the building of the pipeline that

was supposed to come down from Alaska and the Mackenzie Delta to the lower 48 states.

We never built the pipeline but here we are in 1993, the Northern Pipeline Agency is still there and it is costing my constituents in Port Moody—Coquitlam and the other taxpayers in Canada $469,000. Is the government really serious about cutting back or not? When I see things like a Northern Pipeline Agency which is a hold-over from some bygone era I wonder if it is really serious.

I do not expect the hon. member for Burlington to be able to identify one expenditure and have all the facts. He might have that but I do not know. What is the process of seriously cutting back programs that are extraneous and not cutting back the programs that really affect people?

Mr. Kempling: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for his question because when I was in the opposition I used to ask the same sort of question. I remember vividly when we closed down an agency that was established during World War I at the time of the Halifax explosion when a number of ammunition ships exploded. A number of people were killed and terrible damage was done.

I recall that our leader at the time was Mr. Stanfield. It was in the 1970s so from 1917 to 1973, I believe, this agency kept working. It had offices, personnel and letterhead. It submitted annual reports and finally it closed down. I think the member realizes that once we start something it is very difficult to close it down.

I remember when the Northern Pipeline Agency was established. I think I had some long talks with the Hon. Mitchell Sharp who headed the agency for a time. It served a purpose but like a lot of things it was hard to close down.

I guess every department of government has been clawed through by Treasury Board to see what changes could be made. We have closed down agencies and something in excess of 40 government departments as I recall, saving billions of dollars and we continue to do this. We have released about 12,000 public servants through attrition and the closing down of departments. We got rid of more than 20 Crown corporations and about 80,000 employees have ceased to be a liability of the government.

On the other hand we have done many other things that we cannot cover in a short speech in the House of Commons. I ask the hon. member to reflect back on the pension legislation we passed a few months ago where we used to carry the government portion of pension liabilities as part of the national debt. All those pensions are now self-funding. The government puts its portion in, the employees put their portion in and those pension funds are now supervised by a board. That is an ongoing thing and over the years it will dramatically help us look after those pension accounts. It is something that should have been done years ago but it was not. Do not ask me why it was not done, it just was not done.

• (1600)

We have made tremendous progress in a few years against a spending estimate that is down now but has been very high, in the billions of dollars, over the past number of years. We are going to continue to do the very best we can.

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, I am just going to add one thing. It is a comment the member will appreciate perhaps in the spirit in which it is intended.

When I was a young member 14 years ago and came to the House, Tommy Douglas had just retired but he was around in the lobby and in the House. I asked him about the estimates once and he told me that all the estimates of all the departments would go through the whole House.

He said he used to come into the House and spend his time listening to and taking part in that debate. That is how he learned about Canada. He had learned about fisheries and Indian issues. He said it was a great learning experience.

It is tough for us now. When I look at this I see that I know bits and pieces through committees that I have sat on. I knew the pipeline from the energy committee and my experience in the north. However there are a lot of areas that I do not know.

This is not a question but just something I want to pass on to the House and to the hon. member. Perhaps the older method of doing things when we actually went through things department by department in the whole House was where we could get an overview rather than having 30 committees and being able to go to only one of them.

I would ask the hon. member to look today at the Northern Pipeline Agency and tell me maybe at some other time whether it really is doing any work. Is Mitchell Sharp still there? Who knows? He was quite a great parliamentarian.

I will have to take the hon. member's word. He is trying to cut back with the exception, perhaps, of this agency.

Mr. Kempling: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member tweaked my memory. I remember Tommy Douglas vividly. He was a great parliamentarian.

The member refers to the procedures about the estimates coming before the House. Actually it was one of the tests of a minister's ability to get his spending estimates through the House. He would bring his estimates into the House and he had to stand in his place in Committee of the Whole and get his estimates passed. If he had an easy time going through with the House and gave reasonable answers then he was considered to be a pretty good minister.

However I think the volume of expenditures has moved so greatly that time just does not permit it. Maybe we should be looking at a procedure that allows that to happen again. I know it is difficult to get into the estimates.

A few years ago we had a gentleman from Treasury Board or the Auditor General—one or the other—who was going member by member through the estimates saying: "What can we do to explain this to you that will make it easier?" A manual was going to be issued.

Then the estimates became so big. There are the supplementaries. If a manual is put on top of that then there is so much paper that it is very difficult to digest it all in the course of the year.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Douglas Young (Acadie—Bathurst): First of all, Mr. Speaker although I would like to say it is a pleasure to take part in this debate on the motion for concurrence in the Main Estimates for the current fiscal year, for me and for the Canadian public the pleasure is not unadulterated.

[*English*]

I must say that in listening to the parliamentary secretary it is a major problem, as raised by my friend who spoke previously in questions and comments, that the estimates now seem to go through the process in a very odd kind of way.

If we look at what actually is done in committee with estimates, it is very little. I find it rather sad that in this House, and in other arenas related to the parliamentary process, people will discuss matters of $100,000 or $1 million.

I do not want to be equated to C.D. Howe and what is a million. We all know that every dollar is important. It seems there is a lot more focus and a lot more interest on the kinds of amounts of money that we can understand and grapple with. Those are the things we pursue. Yet hundreds of millions and even billions of dollars are spent with very little public scrutiny and very little public understanding.

• (1605)

It seems to me that if we are going to recognize our obligation as parliamentarians to restore confidence in the Canadian political system and try to overcome the cynicism that is out there, then we are going to have to be far more effective in dealing with these kinds of measures.

Today we are talking about $161 billion in spending. We talked about this since the budget process was initiated. People in committee, special interest groups around the country, individuals, organizations and those in sectors of our economy that are affected by increases and decreases and changes in the spending patterns of the government have had their say. However, I want to spend a little bit of time today trying to put the notion of spending and taxation and the financial activity of government into perspective.

There is a little quiz that I developed. I use it in various ways when I go to high schools and universities and speak to groups that are preoccupied with the debt and deficit. If we are speaking today of the government's expenditure plan involving some $161 billion, then we are at the same time talking about the fact that the government will only raise somewhere in the neighbourhood of $125 billion to $130 billion. This leaves a shortfall of $30 billion.

As I was saying to my colleague from Hamilton moments ago, it is a pathetic commentary on our system and our society that we can talk about $161 billion as though we knew what we were talking about. For example, in speaking with young people, and some not so young who are preoccupied with debt, they are concerned about the debt because they know it is a tremendous burden on their future. They know that the kinds of opportunities that will be made available to them will not

be the same kinds of opportunities available to me and my generation when we were growing up. They know that governments of every political stripe, provincially and federally, for many years have mortgaged the future of many of our young people.

At the same time, people not quite so young are concerned about whether or not the investments they made in their futures and their senior years will pay off. Will the Canada Pension Plan survive the changes in our society and the changes in Canada's financial situation? Will medicare, unemployment insurance and the social safety nets be kept in place? Will an economy in Canada be capable of making sure that happens? There is a great deal of unease out there.

Here we have politicians and bureaucrats and many of them have never made a payroll or been involved on Friday afternoon with the bottom line and whether it is red or black or something to which they ever had to pay attention. Yet they have a great deal to say about huge amounts of money.

When I go into these fora such as high schools, universities, community colleges, community groups and so forth I try to use examples that I hope will help them to understand what some of us are so glib about as we talk about these enormous expenditures. For example the national federal debt is somewhere in the neighbourhood of $480 billion. That is a lot of money. I am sure that every Canadian understands that $480 billion is a lot of money, but let us turn it on its head and try to use—I know some members in this House were always opposed to metric—a simple exercise to see if we can, as Canadians, get a notion of what we are talking about.

Take $4.80. It may buy a big Mac, a coke and a side order of French fries. This is something that Canadians can cope with. Take $48. Father's Day is coming up so maybe we will take dad out to a reasonably good restaurant and buy him a beer or maybe a not too expensive bottle of wine. One can have dinner for two and it is a pleasant evening out. Take $480. This may be a weekend at a good hotel celebrating a couple's anniversary. Take $4,800. Maybe we will get a trip to Florida for $4,800. A couple takes off and spends a few weeks in what they hope will be the sunshine in an exotic area in the United States or in the Caribbean.

• (1610)

How about $48,000? For $48,000, one might think about buying a Cadillac, a Lincoln or some other luxury car, but we are starting to talk some money at $48,000. My colleague from Ottawa says that would buy a summer cottage.

With $480,000 we are talking about a luxury home in one of the very exclusive neighbourhoods in the major cities of Canada. I think Canadians whether they live in a bungalow or in a so-called mansion can grapple with $480,000.

Let us talk about $4.8 million. That is a lot of money and it is a big number. I think most Canadians would say that we are starting to get out of their league with $4.8 million.

But what about $48 million? How many thousand dollars are there in $48 million? How many $2 bills are there in $48 million? What could I buy with $48 million? We hear about these huge lotto opportunities that arise every now and then. In my view $48 million is really beyond the pale for most Canadians.

Then we talk about $480 million and we are a long way from the big Mac, coke and French fries. However, at $480 million we are still talking peanuts in the context of the fiscal situation of Canada.

We could talk about $4.8 billion. Now we are into the stratosphere. Politicians talk about that when they say that helicopters are only around $5 billion, which is $4.8 billion plus a few hundred million. It is a long way from my big Mac at $4.80.

Then we talk about $480 billion. How many hundred dollar bills are there in $480 billion? How many thousand dollar bills? How many SkyDomes are there in $480 billion? Let us do the exercise. Let us say SkyDome costs roughly $480 million. It just happens to be a figure that works out. How many SkyDomes could we have in Canada if we were able to use the national debt for purchasing? We would probably have 1,000 of them. Imagine that communities of 200 and 300 people in Canada would have a SkyDome if we took the debt and transferred it.

What is incredible about this is that collectively, the economists, the politicians and the bureaucrats have moved into jargon, systems, programs and processes that have fostered the cynicism of Canadians who say: "I do not think they know what they are talking about. I cannot understand it, but as I watch them perform and as I see what is happening to my country, I do not really think that any of us really have a grasp of this".

Surely there has to be a way. The point I want to make in this presentation is we must restore integrity to the system. I cannot let this pass. I want to be very serious because we are dealing with a very important problem when we talk about the understanding of Canadian taxpayers in the estimates process and how much money we are spending.

Today in the "Report on Business" in *The Globe and Mail* I see: "Bureaucrat warns of tax revolt. Canadians may be driven offshore, finance official tells MPs".

This official, David Dodge, is now the deputy minister of finance. He was the assistant deputy minister of finance when I sat on the finance committee and we went through the goods and services tax exposé. This is the chap who assured Canadians that the goods and services tax was the only way to go, that it was the right thing to do and was a model that would be followed by nations around the world.

The Australian government just used the GST to get itself re-elected. For those who did not follow the Australian election, they used Canada as an example of what happens to governments that bring in GST. Of course, the opposition in Australia was suggesting it might just do that.

I want to point out that if there is real cynicism and frustration on the part of Canadians, here is a senior bureaucrat, the top bureaucrat in the Department of Finance suggesting that there might be a tax revolt. He was the architect and the most staunch defender of the goods and services tax, which has been described by the Canadian Federation of Independent Business as the nightmare on Main Street.

• (1615)

The CFIB talks about the only way to deal with the GST. I quote: "The Canadian Federation of Independent Business will try to play a constructive role in the ongoing reform of Canada's sales tax system and will go to the membership for a fresh mandate when a new government is formed and new options are presented to the Canadian public. A new sales tax initiative requires political leadership and a new spirit of co-operation between all the political and economic partners".

Certainly that is the answer to the GST morass, but to have the senior bureaucrat in the Department of Finance go further and say that it would be very difficult to raise personal income taxes, he says: "Whether we can go higher is up to you as politicians".

We have to come to grips with the fact that Canadians are really questioning the integrity of the system. They are asking us as politicians. They are going to be very aggressive in asking us over the next few months when we go out on the hustings as some of us try to get elected and many others across the country will try to get elected for the first time.

There is no doubt that Canadians understand that in a time of financial crisis resources have to be well managed. I do not think that anybody in the country is interested in having anyone point to the NDP governments of Ontario, Saskatchewan, British Columbia or the former Liberal government or the current Conservative government on the federal scene and say: "They did a terrible job". We all know that. Everybody is just trying to do the best job they can to try to get the country back on track.

What I want to suggest today falls directly into what was said by my colleague from the NDP in terms of the estimates process here and the response of the parliamentary secretary.

If we are going to have any chance of convincing Canadians that they have to continue paying taxes and have to continue dealing with the cutbacks in services and programs, they are going to have to buckle down.

Governments are going to have to be extremely serious and very up front with what they are going to do. We are going to have to establish measurable goals. Political parties and governments are going to have to tell Canadians where they expect to be based on their policies and programs within a certain period of time. Those goals will have to be measurable. The systems to report on those goals will have to be transparent.

There has been work done in trying to develop an accountability process that Canadians and parliamentarians can understand. Looking at the estimates and the Public Accounts, volumes of material are available. All of it is there, if you can find it. However, I defy most Canadians to ever try to get to the bottom of it, even in following one very focused line of thought. It is very complex. It is very difficult.

Surely with the electronic and information technology available now we should be able to deal in the accountability process in a very transparent way. Tell Canadians what is going on. That process of accountability has to be relevant. It has to be reliable. It has to be understandable. It has to be consistent. If we set those goals and we set our objectives and if we do not meet them, we have to tell the Canadian people why.

For example if there is a spending program in Canada and there is a huge crisis in the west for grain farmers and it throws everything off the track, I think Canadians understand that, but they want to be told: "This is why we are not meeting our deficit objectives. This is why we cannot do what we said we would do. It is because we are taking care of the farmers". Or it could be the Atlantic fishermen or a major crisis in the automotive industry which changes the picture.

In order to do that, it is going to take a lot of co-operation in this place. When we talk about accountability, we are going to have to talk about how we reform this place. How MPs participate in the process and the kind of input we have in preparing the spending plans as opposed to dealing with historical facts when we come back on Public Accounts.

When the estimates are deemed to have been passed tonight anyway no matter how much we talk here today, does anybody really think we could move an amendment to change one penny in the spending plans of government?

We may have to create a hybrid system from the traditional British parliamentary system of democracy and the systems in the United States and other jurisdictions, but surely we have a responsibility to move in that direction. This would demonstrate to Canadians that we are serious about trying to get our house in order and that we are going to share the information. That is essential if Canadians are going to understand what we are trying to achieve.

• (1620)

Part of that process we have to deal with and that I want to raise in this discussion of the estimates today is that traditionally we have had Auditors General report on the spending of government and deal with the accountability process.

The processes in various departments are checked to see if the job is being done properly. Much of that is historic. It is long after the fact. It is after the accountants and the specialists in the Auditor General's office have gone into departments. Then a report is produced, usually in October or November of each year.

I know my following recommendation is going to mean amendments to clarify existing legislation. However it seems to be the kind of thing Canadians would agree with. In other jurisdictions, the Auditor General reports on a timely, periodic basis. In other words when the Auditor General finds out what is going on in a specific area and has concerns and observations to make, that information should be tabled. Then parliamentarians and Canadians would regularly find out exactly what is going on with the expenditure of taxpayers' money.

In Britain there are some 40 reports a year by the Auditor General and Comptroller General. The office over there is combined. It is not a question of saying to the government 40 times a year: "Well, we have got you". Generally speaking, the fact the information is brought forward regularly rather than for political partisan reasons does result in better administration of the public money. On a regular basis, far more quickly than what occurs in Canada now, British parliamentarians and the British people are made aware of problems discovered by the Auditor General.

We believe that Canadians understand the debt and the deficit in terms of the challenge it presents and that it is a serious problem. Overwhelming debt and huge continuing deficits will destroy any future this country might have. Members, whether they are Liberals, Conservatives, NDP, Reform or Bloc Quebecois will have to deal with that reality.

As we proceed over the next few years, politicians should be committed to looking at every government program and policy on a zero base. We should justify everything we do.

We should be saying to people: Certainly we want to ensure that there is free universal access to medicare. Certainly we want to ensure the integrity of the Canada Pension Plan. Certainly we want to make sure that unemployment insurance and support for the unemployed is there. Sure we want manpower training. Yes, there will be transfers to the provinces, but are they being administered efficiently? Is everything being done to make sure they are viable and rational programs?

Sacred cows no longer are going to be tolerated in this country. Canadians will insist on transparency in the system, accountability on the part of governments and parliamentarians. They are not going to insist because they feel that we need to be held to task. They know that without transparency and accountability the problems we are in now will be exacerbated in the future.

We have talked about doubling the debt in the last seven or eight years. We can talk about all the reasons for it, but that is not relevant. What do we do about the debt and the deficit in the future?

I hope when we next address the estimates in this House, both Canadians and parliamentarians will have a much better understanding of what this process is all about.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say, first of all, that in addition to being relevant, the comments by the hon. member for Acadie—Bathurst went well beyond what we usually hear in this House.

[*English*]

I want to congratulate the member for his insightful purview of the debt problem we have in this country and the positive suggestions he made.

The hon. member described in plain, ordinary terms the dangers of pursuing a course of deficit and debt increase. Ultimately it is always the Canadian taxpayer who at the end of the day has to pay the note. Unfortunately for too long governments at all levels have looked to not just the grandchildren but unborn Canadians to pay the price of these programs we have today.

• (1625)

I am sure the government, the President of Treasury Board and the Minister of Finance would want to look at the proposal to have the Auditor General report more regularly as is done in Britain.

However, when we talk about goals, in the latest budget the Minister of Finance set as a goal the reduction of the deficit to .9 of 1 per cent by the end of this fiscal framework, which is the next five years. That is a goal, but is that a goal the hon. member shares?

Some people were looking at the latest budget in which it is being proposed that government spending be reduced by $30 billion. That is a serious amount of money over a period of five years and the impact it will have. What does the hon. member say about that goal? Is that not the kind of goal he is proposing?

The other remarks by the hon. member are very relevant to what this government has been pursuing. The hon. member was not partisan in his comments and I do not want to be partisan either. For a period of eight years now since being given its mandate in 1988, I cannot believe every measure proposed by the government to cut expenditures, to cut the deficit, has been opposed by everyone on that side of the House who is not a member of this party.

I took it that he was calling for Canadian men and women and young Canadians to be part of and to understand the process. On every measure proposed, the Leader of the Opposition and the leader of the NDP stand in the House to condemn every step. Maybe I am wrong, but how can the hon. member advocate what he rightly points out should be done? We do not seem to be able to live through it and to see it happen.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Young (Acadie—Bathurst): Mr. Speaker, first of all, on the subject of deficit reduction, I think everyone agrees that we should try and reduce the deficit by every means at our disposal, and the government's objectives certainly have their merits.

However, having been the finance critic for some time now, I can say that, for various reasons, the government's objectives have not been met, and especially its long-term plan for deficit reduction. If I remember correctly,

according to its forecast at the time, by now the deficit should be less than $20 billion. However, we all know that this year the deficit will probably go over $30 billion.

I understand the minister's concern about trying to find ways for government to reduce its operating costs. Many of the votes we were discussing today, for instance, involve statutory requirements representing up to 70 per cent of the vote.

[*English*]

I understand the problem of the minister. I understand the problem of the government.

When I talk about reform of this place I think the nature of opposition has to be looked at. The automatic knee-jerk reaction to everything proposed by the government is bad. Very little support for most initiatives of government is an inheritance of the British parliamentary system where all members on one side vote one way and most members on the other side vote another way. I think it is something that needs to be questioned.

I want to address the problem that was raised by the minister in terms of how we deal with some of the initiatives of the government designed to reduce expenditures. This is where I think we run into a problem with the off-loading.

• (1630)

Fundamental to any hope of re-establishing fiscal integrity is a tripartite national conference involving the federal government, the provincial ministers of finance and the municipalities. I do not think there is any future for the country in terms of dealing with the $700 billion we have in the public debt without sitting down in a very serious and structured way to deal with the problem of national public debt.

To exclude the city of Toronto and to include New Brunswick, to exclude the city of Montreal and to include Manitoba, to exclude the growing, burgeoning city of Vancouver and to include Prince Edward Island in my view in talking seriously about tax reform is nonsense.

Perhaps the minister will take this as a suggestion, as would any government that wants to be serious about debt reduction and eventually the elimination of the deficit. It is childish to speak about reducing the debt so long as we are running a deficit. I do not care how we apply funds or what jargon we use.

The member for Mississauga North was chairman of the finance committee at the time the mayor of Vancouver, the first time I heard the proposal put forward, talked about the implications of off-loading. Just changing responsibilities from one level of government to another will not change anything.

One recommendation I would make is to develop a program, a beginning, not call people in, put on the television lights and have them posture about who are the good guys, who are the bad guys, who is paying the price, how municipal infrastructure needs to be paid for, and all the rest of it. All the people who represent the interests of the taxpayers—whether federal, provincial or municipal the tax bill goes to the same taxpayer—should sit down together to find out how we can deal with what people perceive, other than lack of jobs, as being the single most important problem in the country, that is the fiscal morass we are into with the debt and the deficit.

One recommendation would be for a national conference on debt management involving the three levels of government.

Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—St. Clair): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to have an opportunity to speak on the last supply day in debate on the government's estimates. Quite frankly this is the dying gasp of a tired government. For eight years or nearly nine the government has pursued a neo-conservative agenda which has been expressed in a variety of ways and has caused a great deal of harm to our country. It has created great doubts about the future of the nation, caused a great deal of unemployment and caused a great deal of misery. Increasingly there are indications of civil strife as expressed by the demonstration that took place on the Hill last Saturday.

There is a preoccupation, not an unreasonable preoccupation, with the deficit. However, one thing all of us here and across the nation ought to recognize is that the deficit is a specific result of an over-all thrust, an ideological thrust imposed upon this nation. It has been the borrowing of a neo-conservative perspective best represented by George Bush, Margaret Thatcher and the Prime Minister which says that government is best that does the least, most particularly that government is best that does the least for the vast majority of people in favour of allowing transnational corporations to go

where they want, to invest where they want, to build factories where they want and to move jobs where they choose.

• (1635)

Not since the Depression have the corporations had such power and freedom as what is evolving now under the umbrella not only of the free trade agreement but also under the prospect of NAFTA which will make it worse. As one of my colleagues indicated earlier, the American domination of GATT makes it as much a contributor to the over-all international application of neo-conservatism that is causing so much harm and so much damage.

The deficit is just a part of the result of this over-all agenda. One of the things that is not clear is when this agenda began to be applied. In fact that agenda began to be applied in the 1970s when the Liberals rejected what many would have considered a sincere effort of tax reform advocated by Mr. MacEachen. It instead moved to change tax policy to provide a lesser burden on corporations. The result has been a much smaller proportion of tax revenues paid by corporations and a much larger proportion paid on the basis of personal income tax and other sources.

It also introduced changes in the tax system which benefited not just corporations but those who are wealthy and rich and who have a good deal more influence than ordinary Canadians. The result of this, quite frankly as was found by Statistics Canada, was a considerable budget shortfall. Deficits began to mount as expenditures began to mount in the face of the depression of the early 1980s.

It should be recognized that during the recession of the early 1980s there was another contributing factor. That was a high interest rate policy that began to contribute as significantly as a revenue shortfall.

The combination of this was the accumulation of a debt of approximately $200 billion as a result of Liberal policies favouring corporations and the rich at the expense of ordinary Canadians.

An inflation fighting increase in interest rates, a pattern which has continued to this day, is based on the notion that the appropriate way to fight inflation is to generate unemployment by means of high interest rates. As we recall interest rates mounted to 22 per cent.

Then came the Conservative government that continued this pattern of favouritism toward the large corporations and the wealthy. Then we also had Mr. Crow, confronted with burgeoning unemployment and inflation as well, choosing once again that characteristic approach of trying to fight inflation on the backs of the unemployed.

There is one thing that has to be recognized and it was demonstrated by Statistics Canada in its study. From 1975 until now, the burgeoning debt and continuing deficits were a result specifically of favouritism toward those corporations and the wealthy. That went to the extent that 44 per cent of the present debt is attributable to the shortfall in revenue resulting from that favourable treatment for those best off in our society.

• (1640)

As well, it should be noted that 50 per cent of the accumulated debt is a result of interest rates on the debt. It was as a direct result of the high interest rate policy of the Liberals as well as that of the Conservatives. It was the high interest rate policy that raised the value of the dollar and cut back on exports. It was the high interest rate that generated, according to a WEFA study, some 400,000 unemployed all by itself.

We talk about the deficit which has become an excuse for this government not to undertake initiatives that would have created jobs and a new knowledge based economy that this country must achieve if it is to compete internationally. However, that is only part of the equation. The other part of the equation is the unemployment it generated. This is unemployment in addition to that generated by high interest rates alone. It has to be emphasized that unemployment was deliberately incurred by the Bank of Canada under Mr. Crow specifically to keep inflation under control at the expense of the most powerless in our society.

We then had the other part of the corporate agenda which is the free trade agreement. As a result of the free trade agreement, according to numerous studies, it generated something in the order of 350,000 unemployed by itself.

It must be clear that if we have unemployment and closed factories that—

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order in midstream here. It is somewhat distracting to have a member carrying on a conversation with one of the pages at his feet. Is it okay for me to proceed?

As a result of the free trade agreement, some 350,000 additional unemployed were generated as a direct result of a government that saw the free trade agreement as an appropriate initiative within the context of a neo-conservative agenda. However, the over-all result is obvious. If we have unemployment then we have people who are not paying taxes. If we have closed factories then we have businesses that are not paying taxes. Furthermore, if we have a situation of unemployment then government has to pay out a good deal in terms of social support systems of various sorts to those who have become unemployed and that is a burden.

In fact, for every unemployed individual, $17,000 in costs are incurred. If we look at the level of unemployment right now $27 billion is taken out of the coffers of the government.

What is clear is that we are confronted with a situation in which the government is attacking social programs and we have various Conservative candidates contesting with one another to see who can propose the sharpest cuts in medicare, in unemployment insurance and in our social programs which have benefited Canadians.

This neo-conservative agenda, which did not achieve so much success before the Depression, continues to repeat the mistakes of the Depression.

• (1645)

The last time corporations and international financiers had so much power was just before the Depression. That era was also the last period during which we did not have the kinds of social programs that we have now to support those who have suffered as a result of the excesses of international financiers and corporations who then, as now, have the freedom to go where they choose for the lowest wages, weakest social programs, poorest health and environmental standards are poorest and where the tax burden is the least for those corporations. It wants to complete the story.

The consequences are inevitable. We see it around the world. It is that this approach contains within it the seeds of its own destruction. If this continues—the transnational corporations being able to go where they want for the least cost, least burden and least responsibility—then who will buy their products? Who will protect them against the masses of unemployed, powerless, excluded and alienated?

The deficit on the one hand is a result of a policy of favouritism that ignores the responsibilities of nations. It is supported by trade arrangements that seem to say that governments have no responsibility and that corporations will not address their responsibilities. The deficit fundamentally is a problem of revenues and it is a problem of unemployment. It is a problem of an arrangement that makes it impossible for the government, that ought to serve people, to act in ways which will serve people.

If there is to be an answer to it then it is not to be found in a continuation of the policies of this government and it cannot be found in the policies proposed by the Liberals. The Liberals are part of the problem. It was the Liberals who began the deficit and the neo-conservative agenda continued by this government.

There must be a change and that change is to be found in a renewal of the social democratic approach which recognizes that if we are going to have prosperity then it has to be on the basis in this new global economic world of empowering people. It has to be based on investment in our nation. It has to be based on the kinds of measures that the New Democratic Party has specifically proposed in order to put people back to work.

Here is what we will find if all of our program is implemented. The deficit will cease to be a problem for exactly the reasons that we outlined earlier. People will go back to work. Revenues will be once again generated. The cost to government of unemployment will be eliminated. To speak of that, it has to involve an abrogation of the free trade agreement. It has to involve a setting aside of NAFTA. It must involve changes in monetary policy. It must involve a decrease in interest rates because each decrease in interest rates generates jobs and at the same time it also cuts back on the deficit.

Today, according to the government's own papers, the deficit contributes directly to the level of interest rates. The deficit is the cost of paying the interest rates on the debt.

The Liberals would not abrogate the free trade agreement. God knows what they would do with NAFTA. We would abrogate and we would introduce initiatives to create jobs.

• (1650)

The result is that the deficit over the period of a New Democratic government will be all but eliminated. The deficit will be eliminated and then we can begin to work on the cutting back of the debt.

What does this program involve? First of all it involves an infrastructure program that will prepare our nation with the grounds and the means of transportation, the electronic highway, and the scientific and educational infrastructure that we need. It will create 130,000 jobs immediately and prepare the way for subsequent economic development.

We propose a national investment fund which would encourage small and medium sized businesses, new businesses, to get off the ground. We project that would create 200,000 new jobs.

We propose a national child care program. It is part of our initiative from day care to doctorates to provide training and education for Canadian workers. That would create 70,000 jobs.

We would establish a national council on education to make our educational programs throughout the nation more in accord with our economic goals and to ensure equity and real accomplishment by students in the work place. In order to fund training in industry we would have a grant levy system to pay for it.

We would increase research and development, double IRAP funding, increase funding for the granting councils and find better methods than are presently used now to encourage industry to do research and development in house.

We would undertake initiatives to ensure that our natural resources are processed here to produce jobs in Canada rather than elsewhere.

By doing this the problem of the deficit would be addressed in the only way it can be addressed. That is by putting people back to work. We would create a country in which the government once more has the capacity and will to ensure that we have a sense of community in which we understand as Canadians that government is the means by which we express our responsibility to another. We propose to give people not a hand out but a hand up. That is how the deficit would be addressed, not on the backs of the unemployed but by creating employment.

Mr. Ian Waddell (Port Moody—Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the hon. member on an excellent speech and the fact that he actually dealt with the deficit in a way in which the country could live with. It is a way of putting people back to work in order to tackle that deficit. He has dealt with both problems, unemployment and the deficit, in a passionate way as he usually does.

I want to make a couple of comments and I want to ask him a question. The member who spoke previously quoted an article in the paper today about a Mr. Dodge, who is now a deputy minister of finance. Mr. Dodge goes on in the letter to say that the taxpayers are on the edge of a revolt and they do not want to be taxed any more. He wrote that even though Mr. Dodge made a lot of the taxes they are going to revolt against.

He goes on to talk about the Bank of Canada. He says that despite the pessimistic predictions, the Canadian economy in 1988 grew very strongly. The bank kept the screws on. The bank kept its monetary policy and high interest rates and kept going. He said that even for 1989. Then he says: "The banks squeezed harder but the reaction in the form of slowing in the wages and prices really did not show up until 1991". He was talking about southern Ontario.

Then he says, and this is the understatement of the decade: "We did make some mistakes, all of us, and that caused the adjustments problem". The adjustments problem meaning 12 per cent unemployment, 20 per cent or 25 per cent unemployment among young people, poverty, hardship, a growing deficit, Canada being rolled toward the position of a Third World country and recession in the country. It is an adjustment problem.

This is the kind of thing we face in dealing with the banks.

• (1655)

The second point I want to make, and the hon. member for Windsor said this, is that the Liberals were part of the problem. I was here in the early eighties when the Liberals had a National Energy Program. In committee I learned they gave out $13 billion, in 1970s money, in the form of PIP grants, petroleum incentive grants, on the Canada lands and in Alberta. For $13 billion in grants to oil companies they only took one tanker out of the north. It seems to me the origin of our national debt was the Liberal regime of the period. That was where it started getting out of hand.

Today the government's expenditures and revenues are about equal. The shortfall is in debt payments. The member talked about high interest rates. Normal Canadians say that they are going down, that they are about 5 or 6 per cent on their mortgage so that is great.

What does the hon. member mean when he says that interest rates are still too high and that one of the problems caused by this government right now with regard to the debt is in the monetary policy? Could he comment on that?

Mr. McCurdy: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for the question.

Yes, we are talking about real interest rates. That is the difference between the cost of borrowing and the increase in the CPI.

The fact is that right now and for this past decade for the first time our interest rates have been as high as they were during the Depression. That is very interesting. Only in the last Great Depression, and I mean the thirties, were real interest rates as high as they are now.

Not since the thirties has there been such unencumbered freedom for transnationals and financiers to advantage themselves. There are so many parallels between now and then that it ought to cause us all to wonder. Did we not learn from the Depression that we cannot have a world in which the selfish greed of corporations can be pursued without limits, controls or regulations because inevitably that will be at the expense of the vast majority of people. That cannot go on.

Right across this world, across this land and across Europe we are seeing the results of it as unemployment mounts. All other statistics indicate economic growth, whether it be GDP, inventories or any of those things that this government cites, but the fact of the matter is that unemployment continues to mount.

Germany, a nation that has had an unemployment rate of 4 per cent or less for many years, today has an unemployment rate of 12 per cent. That is the inevitable result of a system in which corporations are free of any obligations to any nation. A policy such as that which has generated the deficit, which favours corporations as the Liberals did to an extreme and as the Conservatives are doing now to an equal extreme, is a policy that means devastation for too many, as we see now, and that must change.

Mr. Joe Comuzzi (Thunder Bay—Nipigon): Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the hon. member from Windsor on the speech he just gave. During his work career I know that he was a teacher at the university I attended. I thought he would have taken some of the economic courses for which the University of Windsor is noted.

I was interested in his remarks with respect to how he anticipates he could bring the budget we are discussing here today under a zero deficit and start paying off the debt.

• (1700)

It appears to me that on the one hand what he is saying should be applied, but to the Government of Ontario. On the other hand, perhaps what we should be doing is consolidating his thinking in respect to the creation of jobs and the reduction of the deficit with respect to what this government across is doing for the whole of Canada and what he is proposing should be done by this government.

Given the realities of governments, which Premier Rae is beginning to realize today, how does the member propose putting those philosophical issues that he propounded here today in this House and apply them to the province of Ontario? The province of Ontario is the economic generator for Canada and if we could get Ontario going again then certainly we could get Canada going again.

Mr. McCurdy: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member indicates, I did once teach him but I failed. I took all of those economic courses at the University of Windsor and I guess he failed there too.

Ontario is a classic example of the subtlety with which the neo-conservative agenda has succeeded. I am not talking about the cuts in transfer payments to the provinces. I am not talking about the increased burden of social assistance payments that have been imposed upon the provinces. I am not talking about the inequity of this federal government in its treatment of Quebec versus

Ontario with respect to the payment for the cost of immigration and refugees. I am talking about a situation in which high interest rates and a burgeoning debt, which have resulted partly from that and are partly due to the fact that the Liberals had a secret debt that they left behind when Premier Rae came to office.

Its freedom is considerably limited if there is not some kind of co-ordination of monetary policy and fiscal policy between the federal and provincial governments. The province does not control monetary policy. It does not control the high interest policy. All of the provinces are burdened with that.

One thing that is important to understand is that the degree of freedom of any province, and especially Ontario, is significantly affected by the free trade agreement. It is well known that Ontario lost nearly 300,000 industrial jobs from the free trade agreement alone, certainly a significant portion of them, and 397 plants went down south.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour for me to participate in the debate on the main estimates for 1993-94. This budget shows this government's commitment to control spending and to implement measures that will lead to major gains in efficiency. Of course, we must continue to strive to deliver as efficiently as possible the services that Canadians want. We are now in a period requiring changes, and I submit to you that Canadians are ready to support the government in its efforts to make this transition successfully.

You will find in these main estimates many savings that should make it possible to achieve the measures announced in the budget of February 1992 and the December economic and fiscal statement. In making these savings, the government has made significant progress in disposing of activities, agencies and organizations that no longer meet an essential public need. This practice is compatible with our philosophy of maintaining a fair balance between the demands for federal services from Canadian citizens and our ability as a country to pay for these services through the tax revenue which we collect.

• (1705)

[*English*]

We have recorded numerous achievements in the area of expenditure management over the past eight years. Allow me to provide you with a few examples.

Program spending has been held at 16.7 per cent of Canada's gross domestic product for the past two years compared to 20 per cent in 1984. During the same period the growth in programs spending, including Public Service salaries, has averaged only 3.7 per cent per year as compared to an average inflation rate of 4 per cent per year. This translates into a net real decline of 2.6 per cent.

In the 1991 budget a commitment was made to introduce legislation that would limit programs spending for the next five years. The Spending Control Act has been approved by this House and the spending plans outlined in these main estimates are well within the limits set out in that piece of legislation. In fact the Minister of Finance has announced that the limits under the act will be further reduced to bring them in line with the reductions set out in our recent budget.

These examples clearly demonstrate the government's commitment to restraint and improved efficiency. Careful stewardship of taxpayers' dollars is being and will continue to be exercised through the rigorous control of expenditures as well as the implementation of innovative management practices.

Since taking office in 1984 our record in that regard has been one of success. In keeping with this tradition these estimates for 1993-94 will live up to the high expectations that Canadians have set for this government.

This year the main estimates total $161.4 billion and through these estimates the government is seeking Parliament's approval for $48.9 billion in new spending authority, of which some $13.9 billion of interim supply was granted earlier through Appropriation Act No. 1 of 1993-94. The remaining $112.2 billion represents statutory payments that have been granted previous parliamentary approval.

The growth in the main estimates of 0.4 per cent is the outcome of a number of decisions and factors affecting

the budgets of all 137 programs by 111 departments, agencies and Crown corporations appearing in the estimates. This growth can be divided into two broad categories: adjustment to statutory items, which amount to a net increase of $423 million or 74 per cent of the year over year growth, and changes to voted items which amount to $140 million or 26 per cent of the year over year growth.

Canadians have indicated that they want governments to be more frugal in their spending, make smart investments that will provide a multiple pay-back, avoid expensive future costs and improve efficiency so Canadians receive more value for their tax dollar.

To this end the government continues to carefully scrutinize resource requests by federal government agencies. We must meet the challenges of restraint and serving Canadians in the best way possible to ensure that spending takes place only where Canadians need or want to receive services.

• (1710)

The Minister of Finance in his latest budget announced a series of initiatives that will bring about significant reductions in expenditures and contribute to lasting efficiencies in government programs and services. A total of $30 billion was announced in spending cuts and other measures. The cost of government will be reduced in 1993-94 as a result of the cuts in operating budgets by $12 billion annually by 1997-98. Program expenditures will be restrained in many areas, including defence spending and operating subsidies.

The reduction in grants and contributions for 1993-94 as announced in the December economic statement will be maintained with further and deeper reductions coming in future years. Expenditures on social housing will not be increasing in future years but will remain at the current level of approximately $2 billion a year. Funding directed toward shelters for victims of violence, housing on Indian reserves and persons with disabilities will continue as planned. Ongoing expenditure restraint has left government departments with approximately 30 per cent less purchasing power than was available to them in 1985.

Given that the cuts outlined by the Minister of Finance will continue through 1997 and 1998, tough decisions will be necessary regarding the future of programs that we Canadians may no longer be able to afford. In addition to the expenditure reductions announced in the budgets, the restructuring of government is an imperative toward achieving increased government efficiency. Since 1984 we have been pro-active in this area. Twenty Crown corporations have been sold or dissolved and 40 more government organizations have been wound up, merged or consolidated. Considerable savings are possible through a continued emphasis on government restructuring and streamlining.

Cost recovery and user fees have been actively promoted by this government for the collection of revenue for services that benefit a small portion of the population. This system removes the obligation from taxpayers to involuntarily pay for a service which they do not use. With the implementation of user fees the government will maintain services that might otherwise be eliminated. Simply put, those who benefit the most from the service should contribute the most. The end result of cost recovery and user fees has been the fostering of a more service-oriented, market-based approach to conducting government business.

[*Translation*]

In the past eight years these user fees contributed greatly to helping the government maintain service delivery. Since 1985 the funds collected annually through this payment system have doubled and are now well over $3 billion.

• (1715)

With the current spending cuts, public service managers and organizations have to deal with stable, or in many cases increasing, demand at the same time as available resources continually decline. Managers have had to try to achieve this balance creatively, sensitively and constructively. To deliver programs in this new environment our managers have had to be more innovative and examine their workplace in order to be more efficient.

I think this has resulted in increased team-work and co-operation within the Public Service, as our employees understand their essential role in Canada's competitiveness on world markets. Dedicated and competent federal employees throughout the country and in missions abroad serve Canadians in such fields as health and safety, consumer protection, regional industrial assistance, aid to native people, scientific and technological assistance, foreign aid, representing and protecting our interests abroad, protecting people and property, protecting taxpayers through the fair and efficient administration of the Income Tax Act and customs and excise

legislation and of course in the whole delivery of social programs.

As an employer, the government wishes to recognize this important contribution public servants have made by considering and implementing many new ideas to better meet Canadians' needs and in that way with that quality of service to bring the government closer to the people.

The government continues to give priority to the adoption of innovative management practices. Since it took power it has implemented a wide range of measures to improve operations management. Many recent initiatives flow from Public Service 2000, the major renewal exercise announced by the Prime Minister in 1989.

In the past year tremendous progress has been made under PS 2000. Legislation to reform the Public Service was passed by Parliament and the system of operating budgets now applies to all government departments and organizations.

[*English*]

As of January 1993, 12 special operating agencies have been formally established with two more expected to receive approval shortly. These agencies, while operating within the structure of the Public Service, have been granted special flexibilities in order to manage themselves in a similar fashion to private sector businesses.

The rationale for establishing these agencies is to improve the quality of service to Canadians through the ability to respond quickly to changes in client needs. The Canadian public's expectations of its governments are changing. There is an increasing demand for simpler, quicker and more sophisticated access to government services and information. The government will continue to ensure that Canadians receive a high quality of service while at the same time operating within the resources available.

To do this we will continue to rely on the commitment displayed by Public Service employees in serving their clients. We are also committed to removing obstacles encountered by Canadians in dealing with the government. Our clients should find government services easier to use and more accessible. These goals will primarily be achieved through the restructuring of government operations and continued training of our employees. With this in mind several government initiatives are currently under way.

Standards of services are being developed across government departments through client consultations: a single window concept of delivering government services. This initiative would see several government departments working together to provide a broad range of services at a single point of service delivery.

Canadian business service centres are currently being tested in Edmonton, Winnipeg and Halifax. These centres are designed to provide the business community with quick, accurate information on government services, programs and information at a single point of service. In total, 18 federal departments and agencies are participating in this initiative.

Hours of service are being examined with the aim of becoming more client–oriented and flexible to meet changing client needs. A single business registration number is being tested this year. This number would in some instances replace up to two dozen different numbers currently used across government departments. Departments are also reviewing the forms with the twin goals of eliminating unnecessary paperwork and adopting a more user friendly design. Electronic procurement is becoming widely used within government operations and investment in new technology and employee training will continue to ensure an efficient and effective Public Service for the future.

• (1720)

The message of this government is clear. We are serious about restraint and to this end we have acted on the wish of taxpayers for greater reductions in government spending.

The continuation of government reform is necessary. We must implement new approaches to organizing government operations in order to deliver the services most desired by Canadians. The measures that were announced in the recent budget and in the December economic statement clearly indicate our commitment to sound fiscal management and to reducing the demands on the Canadian taxpayer.

Mr. Joe Comuzzi (Thunder Bay—Nipigon): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the minister some questions with respect to the department for which he is responsible.

His department as we know is twofold, immigration and employment. He and I have talked many times about our thoughts on immigration. We have asked many questions in this House about the immigration problems this country is facing and the horrendous costs that some of those decisions his government has made are adding to this terrible deficit that we are all trying to come to grips with.

I want to concentrate my questions to the minister today on the area that involves employment. As he was making his remarks just a few moments ago on the amounts of money he is requesting to administer his department, the thought just occurred to me that if we could get our economy in some kind of shape, we could create the jobs necessary because it is on his department of employment that the whole country rises and falls. Sometimes he has no control over the amount of expenditure because of the situation and the tragic condition of our economy.

I would think if his government could create these necessary jobs, which I give credit to him for trying to do even though it is simply not working, that the deficit of our country then would come under some kind of control. The very amounts that he is talking about in the expenditure for unemployment is the very amount that this country is in deficit on a national basis.

The creation of employment is really twofold. First we have to look after those people who are entering the work force on an annual basis, the students and those who are coming into the work force for the first time. Unfortunately during this economic period we also have to take care of those people who find that they no longer have a marketable skill and therefore find it necessary to be retrained.

It is in that first instance that I ask the minister why we have not used the technology available to us in Canada in order to enhance that position where we can handle those who are coming into the job market for the first time but more particularly those who need retraining. That involves the unskilled, the issue of upgrading and the issue of the retraining program itself.

The minister and I both know how costly this is to his department this year. I am appalled that we have not used the technology that is available to us in order to enhance that program.

• (1725)

This past weekend I visited friends in one of the northern United States which has the same problems as we have. They have developed, using the technology available to them, a communication network. It has 67 university campuses, college campuses and high school campuses within the state, which is a little smaller than Ontario. It has connected those electronically. It will be providing to those citizens who need upgrading of skills the ability to receive that knowledge in their homes. It will be providing a training program for those who want to enhance their present skills because we know that it is always cheaper to keep a job than creating a new one.

The third item it is going to be progressing with is the ability to take those people whose jobs are now redundant and retrain them for the jobs of the future. Using the technology that we have available in the marketplace we can offer those services at a much lower cost than we are presently paying.

I ask the minister if his department has considered this or if he would like to meet with me afterward to pursue the use of this technology to upgrade and retrain our work force.

Mr. Valcourt: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member points to what is a very important and crucial part of the challenge that all Canadians are facing. This has to do with the necessity of having a framework in this country that allows youth and workers who are displaced by technological change to be able to retrain and acquire the skills and the knowledge they need to be active participants in this economy.

The hon. member will recall that this government, with the changes that we made to the Unemployment Insurance Act, has activated some of these passive funds that were used to give income support and to try to activate them to help unemployed Canadians.

I would point out to the hon. member the fact that in this fiscal year we will be spending $2.4 billion under the UI developmental use portion of that training program which is a 400 per cent increase from two years ago.

Furthermore, out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund we will be spending $1.6 billion on some of those training programs. The challenge, which is one we collectively share as Canadians, is divided among all levels of government. We all know that education and training is a provincial matter in the sense that they are responsible for those institutions.

Through our spending power, yes, we try to help and be helpful and actually at the federal level we spend nationally 73 per cent of all moneys that governments spend for training. It is spent by this department.

The learning component of the prosperity initiative and this private sector group led by Mr. McCamus and Mrs. Marie-Josée Drouin consulted with over 6,000 Canadians in 186 communities, with every business group and union in Canada that were interested in participating and they came up with this plan. One of their recommendations was the electronic highway.

What the hon. member saw in that northern state of the United States of America is exactly what we will be able to do with that infrastructure project which my colleague, the Minister for International Trade and Science and Technology, announced following the December economic statement. That electronic highway will allow us and our partners in the private sector and the provinces to be able to disseminate a lot more skills and knowledge to those displaced workers and to those Canadians who want to acquire the skills and knowledge that will allow them to become active in the labour market.

• (1730)

I think it is a valid point that the hon. member has raised. It is one that we have acted upon and it is one that I will encourage many, many more Canadians to look into. Gone are the days where one level of government some place could fix it. This is a matter for all of us at all levels, and we as Canadians individually—parents, children, educators, leaders in communities—must work together in trying to give us the kind of work force that can succeed in this global economy. These are not buzz words, this is the reality. We must be prepared to do that, and that is what the prosperity action plan calls for, partnerships, which we are encouraging.

I will close on this note. When we look back to December's economic statement and the most recent budget where we announced cuts of $30 billion over five years, one department, mine, employment and immigration was not cut in terms of its training budget. Quite to the contrary, in December we increased spending in order to meet that exact challenge that the hon. member has referred to.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, I would have liked to put a question to the minister or comment on his speech, but in any case, I appreciate his supportive comments. He said, in referring to the speech by the hon. member for Acadie—Bathurst, that it was an excellent idea to have the Auditor General of Canada table specific reports in the House, from time to time, so that members would be more aware of the general state of government operations. I agree this is a very good idea. In fact, I introduced a bill in the House about a year and a half ago, which suggests just that.

Now that I have the minister's support, I will try and persuade more ministers to back my proposal. Maybe some day they will do it. I think it would let the Auditor General of Canada do what he is supposed to do, in other words, report from time to time to the House of Commons, as an officer of the House, giving his views on certain developments in the economics of government operations.

Mr. Speaker, we have before us Bill C-134, if I am not mistaken, which proposes to approve some $161 billion in spending by the government for the coming fiscal year.

On February 25 this year, the Conservative government tabled the Main Estimates, indicating the spending plan for 83 departments and agencies for the 1993-94 fiscal year. This spending plan, based on the economic and fiscal statement made by the Minister of Finance on December 2, will require, as I said earlier, about $161 billion plus, with the Supplementary Estimates tabled on May 25, another $414 million, so that the government's total expenditures for the current year add up to $162 billion, or at least that is what we are being asked to approve today.

Mr. Speaker, prior to concurrence in the House, the Estimates are examined in committee. Spending plans are usually examined by parliamentary committees, and at this important stage, all members, irrespective of their party affiliation, can hold the government accountable to

Canadians for the very substantial amounts of money that it wishes to spend.

However, there is, in this case, a big difference between theory and practice. In fact, because of its majority, the government controls the election of the committee chairmen, who are responsible for scheduling meetings to consider the Estimates.

• (1735)

I must say I am extremely concerned and disappointed when I see how some committee chairmen show so little interest in considering the Estimates for their departments. I have some statistics which I could table or send to anyone who is interested in the attendance of committee members or the interest of committees in reviewing expenditures. In fact, the Public Accounts Committee, which I have the pleasure to chair, is the only committee chaired by a member of the opposition. All other committees are usually chaired by a government member.

Now if we look at the statistics for these committees, they are really not impressive. We are talking about major departments like Indian Affairs, Agriculture Canada, Finance, Forestry and Fisheries, National Health and Welfare, Social Affairs, Senior Citizens, Status of Women, and I could go on with the Department of Transport and Official Languages. These parliamentary committees have shown very little interest in the main estimates for their departments or agencies in the years 1991–92 and 1992–93.

As for the 1993–94 main estimates we are being asked to approve today, the record is not particularly impressive. The Standing Committee on Finance, for instance, an important committee of the House which is responsible for examining the votes of the Department of Finance and the Department of National Revenue, representing a total of several billion dollars, did not bother to examine the votes at all. This is indeed a sad commentary.

The Energy, Mines and Resources Committee and the Transport Committee, both very important, did not meet once to examine the estimates. I think this is a major flaw in our parliamentary system that affects the government's accountability to the House of the Commons. I am sorry to say this, but it is irresponsible of members to criticize the government if they fail to provide for thorough scrutiny of the government's estimates, of its spending plans.

Today, only the Conservative members of this House are suicidal enough, if I may use the term, to vote in favour of a motion like the one we have before us today, a request for $161 billion, without prior review of the impact of government spending plans. This is like giving the government a blank cheque. I am not prepared to do that, Mr. Speaker, even if I am in the opposition. I am not prepared to give the executive, the Conservative government in power today, a blank cheque for $161 billion without thorough scrutiny and without ensuring that both transparency and accountability have been part of the process.

I believe I have every reason to say this. When considering the Public Accounts for the fiscal year that has just ended, I saw that the tax provisions for foreign corporations cost Canada hundreds of millions of dollars in foregone revenue. No taxes were paid, even when companies made sizable profits. They did not pay taxes because of loopholes in our tax legislation. What they are doing is not illegal, not against the letter of law, but it is certainly against the intent of the law, as I see it.

According to the Public Accounts, the cost of implementing the GST, which was prohibitive, totalled $1.7 billion, including $808 million in start-up costs and $900 million for transitional credits. The Prosperity Secretariat awarded 22 contracts for a total value of $3.3 million without public tenders. This is very disturbing, but no one queried this. Sixty-five million dollars in pension payments went to recipients who were not entitled to these payments. Extra amounts granted in 1989–90 for the Canada Student Loans Program may cost us $39 million. Canadians do not realize this, but Canadian students owe the Canadian government $1.088 billion. It bothers me that we are being asked to approve a major bill involving $161 billion and that the members of this House did not take the time, in my opinion, to examine this information carefully. Actually, the government is asking us to hold our noses and vote for the bill. I am not prepared to do that. In fact, the government wants to be absolved of its sins without benefit of confession. In the circumstances, I am certainly not prepared to support this bill.

• (1740)

If we examine the reasons for the government's mismanagement, we realize that the Conservative government has not been consistent. After the Throne Speech, the budget is the first document that gives a general view of the government's policies. It reflects the government's financial position. Its impact on programs and program management and the consequences for the deficit and the debt are obvious.

The budget generally includes a collection of miscellaneous statistical information and economic forecasts, and during the past nine years we have been treated to some examples of Conservative rhetoric. This information is supposed to explain to Canadians, in simple terms that are easy to understand, how the government's regulatory decisions, including the monetary policy of the Bank of Canada—and Heaven knows its high interest policy has done a lot of harm—as I was saying, how all this helps to meet the objectives set by a good government that makes decisions with the requisite transparency, in the general public interest.

During the past few years, the Auditor General has elaborated on this subject in his reports, and especially in his 1991 Annual Report, in which he suggested how the government could communicate to the public, in a way that is both informative and effective, the results of its monetary and fiscal policies.

He recommended a "scorecard". In fact, the Auditor General suggested that the government prepare and publish, as part of an annual financial report, a "scorecard" that would show Canadians the results of its deficit reduction plan. These scorecards would compare actual results with budget forecasts. It is too bad the government never introduced this scorecard so that Canadians would have a better understanding of the objectives and the problems involved.

The hon. member for Acadie—Bathurst explained the situation very well, and I think some members would do well to read his speech. If the government had implemented this recommendation by the Auditor General of Canada, it could have avoided the catastrophic discrepancies in recent projections on the deficit. The government has lost a great deal of credibility because it is incapable of producing accurate forecasts.

For instance, in February 1991, the government predicted that the annual deficit for 1991–92 would be $30.5 billion. A year later, 11 months after the beginning of the 1991–92 fiscal year, the government announced that the annual deficit would be $31.4 billion. However, when the financial statements were published last fall, the real deficit was up to $34.6 billion, a difference of more than 13 per cent between what was projected and the actual figure, a difference of more than $14 billion in the projections of the Department of Finance. With all their experts and very sophisticated economic models, they were unable to predict the size of the deficit. They have all the necessary equipment, all the experts, but they cannot give us the proper figures.

• (1745)

In the private sector, someone that incompetent would be dismissed immediately. For eight years now we have been putting up with this government that cannot manage this national debt properly. I recognize the size and magnitude of the debt; I admit that compound interest is a problem. I know that a debt starts off easy, but as it grows, interest on the interest adds to the problem and costs dearly. That is the problem. However, the government has not explained the size of the problem to Canadians. Pressed to justify its predictions that were far off the mark, the Conservative government was never able to provide proper explanations that would have improved its future projections and helped it avoid making the same mistakes all over again.

To reduce the deficit, the Conservatives favoured budget cuts, without first setting priorities. The government did not understand that the deficit, employment, economic growth, inflation, taxation and good management are all inter-related and that co-ordinated, balanced policies are required to get the country out of the mess we are in.

Since the government has such a bad record in predicting the budgetary impact of its poor decisions, who can believe that this government is telling the truth when it tells us that the deficit in 1997–98 will be $8 billion, according to the latest budget? I think that projection is questionable. Besides, who would believe the Conservative leadership candidates who are now promising to wipe out the deficit in four or five years, depending on which one you listen to, without bringing

in new taxes or raising taxes? They should explain what they mean. Many experts tell us that it makes no sense.

Obviously the government has lost control of the debt when the deficit estimates are so far off. Debt management is disastrous now. There has not even been an assessment of debt and debt management; it is important that such an assessment be undertaken. In the Standing Committee on Public Accounts recently we were told that the Department of Finance was starting to think that it would be good to review the debt program. It is high time that this be done.

Over the years the government has borrowed over $70 billion from the federal employees' pension fund without knowing the impact of such a decision on future budgets. By applying this policy blindly, the government does not know if this borrowing is cost-effective or if this policy costs hundreds of millions of dollars. No one has evaluated the impact of this borrowing. Mr. Speaker, $70 billion is a lot of money.

With questionable financial management, the Conservative government is mortgaging the future of several generations of Canadians. In the Ottawa region alone, in my region here, 62,311 people were collecting unemployment insurance or welfare in April 1993, up 4,400 or 7.6 per cent from last year. This is 11.6 per cent of the labour force in the National Capital Region. With the present government, there are 1,581,000 unemployed people and 2,723,000 on welfare; 12,333,000 Canadians are working but they can hardly have confidence in the future when the news is not good, the debt is too high and the government is run so badly.

With a tax rate bordering on 40 per cent, the citizens of Ottawa—Vanier, my riding, like all other Canadians, are fed up with being milked by the government. They want actual figures, reasons, simple, clear and specific information. They want to know how their money is managed. They want the government to account for how it collects and spends their dollars. That is clear. In fact, they want an honest government. The legacy which this government is preparing to leave is too far from these objectives to be what Canadians could consider to be good financial management.

• (1750)

[*English*]

The Conservative record of fiscal mismanagement will go down in history as a great failure. Nine years after the Tories took over the budgetary reins, the national debt has soared to more than $450 billion. During their tenure the Tories have added at least $260 billion to the bill that we and our children must pay. Time and time again the Tories have missed their mark on debt management.

The question to be put: how can we afford this government? I think Canadians will demonstrate soon, this year, that this exorbitant government must be put out to pasture. The failure of the Tories to manage the debt has made many Canadians extremely cynical about their federal government.

More than one-quarter, 26 per cent of government spending, now goes to service the debt. That is up from 20.5 per cent in 1984. The size of our debt has led to a lot of talk in recent months about the debt crisis. It is important to put this in context.

While we must reduce the debt we are carrying as a nation to lessen the burden on taxpayers and the constraints on government, we need not fear that the sky will fall down tomorrow. There are other ways.

As long as we can demonstrate ably to investors that our country is worth investing in, Canada will not be shunned by its lenders. Confidence in our future goes a long way to encourage and reassure investors. However we must show these investors as well as Canadians that both provincial and federal governments are taking the necessary steps to control spending and that deficits must be reduced.

The Tories have neglected accountability which explains much of the current cynicism Canadians feel about their political system.

Today we are more vulnerable to the whims of international investors because the percentage of the federal debt owed to foreigners has grown from 11 per cent in 1984 to 23 per cent today. Again we must be assured—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Order, please. The hon. member's time has expired.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Nic Leblanc (Longueuil): Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to the speech made by the hon. member from Vanier. In my opinion this was a very interesting speech. The hon. member described rather accurately the behaviour of the Conservatives, that is the government, regarding the debt. Of course that debt started to grow under a Liberal government of which my colleague was a member. In fact it can be said that this debt started to grow about 20 years ago.

Nevertheless, the hon. member made a pretty accurate description of the problem but he forgot in my opinion, to elaborate a bit on the actions necessary to reduce that debt. We the members of the Bloc Quebecois believe that the main reason for this debt is bad management, primarily the result of overlapping jurisdictions of the provinces and the federal government. That aspect was overlooked by the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier.

In fact, the experts of the Bélanger–Campeau commission concluded, and these findings were supported by other experts from France and Great Britain, that this overlapping between Quebec and Ottawa alone amounts to some $2.5 to $3 billion a year in unnecessary administration costs. Moreover, we do not see all the consequences and losses of this mismanagement, which has a negative impact on government revenue, and I am only referring to overlapping between Quebec and Ottawa.

However if you look at all the other provinces this overlapping may represent $10 to $12 billion in operating costs, not to mention of course the losses due to this inefficient system. Again, the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier did not mention this aspect.

I would appreciate his opinion on this. It is all right to describe what is going on but solutions must also be suggested. The solution that we, Bloc Quebecois members propose is a decentralization of powers. Quebec must absolutely manage its affairs according to its own priorities. This way, we will help this country, whose debt, as we just learned, is considered by the United Nations experts to be equal to that of developing countries.

• (1755)

I am asking the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier to at least suggest some solutions, since he was a member of that Liberal government for a while.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, solutions do exist. The problem of duplication between levels of government is a major one and we must resolve it. I think that the hon. member for Acadie—Bathurst has come up with a novel idea today that we should consider seriously. He has suggested that the three orders of government—federal, provincial and municipal—work together to reduce this national debt which could be as high as $575 billion altogether.

He has suggested that, since all of them have stewardship obligations—this may not be the best word to describe the idea I want to convey; anyway, governments have to account for the money collected from the taxpayers and the expenses made on their behalf—some kind of balance should be reached. To shift responsibilities as we have been doing for the past few years from the top, federal level to the provinces, which in turn shift the load onto the municipalities, is no solution because there are some very important players or participants involved. There are cities like Toronto, Montreal, Vancouver and other major cities that have a larger population and economy than some provinces but are not involved in setting the monetary or economic policies of this country.

We Liberals have proposed a trilateral conference, so to speak, to bring together the main stakeholders at the federal, provincial and municipal levels so that, together, we can find a solution. It is a matter of stewardship. It is a matter of collective will to solve our problem without passing on to the next level of government, down the line, so to speak, social and financial costs it cannot afford.

[*English*]

Mr. Fred J. Mifflin (Bonavista—Trinity—Conception): Mr. Speaker, first I want to compliment my hon. and learned friend from Vanier who indeed has an established reputation in this House for accountability of government, both in government and in opposition. I believe that in municipal politics and as a school trustee he also established that reputation for accountability. I very much appreciate and respect the points he has made.

I was going to ask him to elaborate on some other measures he might have. I know that time is short, but I just want to make one comment before that.

I learned here this evening and had it confirmed that the training budget in Canada right now through UIC and the Minister of Employment and Immigration is $3.8 billion. I look at how that money is spent versus the job development programs which have meant a great deal for my riding.

I see the member for Burlington who will remember the difficulty we went through when those job development programs were removed. That initiative had given the opportunity for those people who did not have work to get involved in programs. It was a major initiative for communities. It has now been taken away and has given way to $3.8 billion in training programs. I think one has to look at the effectiveness of that. It bears very close watching.

Perhaps in the time remaining my hon. colleague from Vanier could give us indications of some of the other areas of accountability for the over-all management of the public debt he may have in mind.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, I am interested in the question because tomorrow morning in the Standing Committee on Public Accounts we are looking at chapter 9 of the Auditor General's report. It deals exactly with the effectiveness of these employment and immigration programs. If he wants to come and participate in this great experience with the department and its experts, I would be more than pleased to receive him.

The question is one of accountability. Maybe it is a buzz-word, but it is a very important word for Canadians today. Accountability as far as I am concerned is the obligation to explain how one has used one's responsibility. That is what accountability is: responsibilities and the way you use them. Accountability is only meaningful when used in tandem with authority and responsibility.

• (1800)

I know it may be heavy stuff for some people. However if we do not understand that governments must be accountable to us for the way they spend and intend to spend our money, then there is absolutely no way that any government can operate or that any country can work.

I am saying that we have not had accountability as a direct reaction of this government to the people of Canada. I plead with governments in the future. I know our Liberal government when we do form the government will be fully accountable to Canadians on all aspects of public finances.

Mrs. Dorothy Dobbie (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Minister of State (Indian Affairs and Northern Development)): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to engage in this debate. This is a topic that is a grave one to all Canadians. It should be of tremendous interest to all the members in this House.

I want to begin by dealing with a couple of issues. I would like to point out that the main estimates this year show that federal spending will rise only marginally by 1.5 per cent. This is lower than the growth rate, the cost of living and so on. This is the lowest growth rate in decades. It underlines our firm commitment to cutting waste and to improving efficiency in providing full value for every tax dollar spent.

At the same time the move to contain spending creates a real management challenge for us. It is difficult to make these kinds of changes, for example how can government deliver services effectively to Canadians with tight resources. It means we have to change the way we do things and take different approaches.

One of the ways in which we are responding to this challenge is through the Public Service managers. They must be as committed and resourceful as they can possibly be and need the tools to be flexible and innovative in the work place. I believe they are that resourceful and that committed and that they do have the tools, particularly since the spending estimates, they will have the guidelines and the leadership to show them the direction we want to take.

Let me first sketch very briefly the reasons that we need management ingenuity to ensure that Canadians continue to be as well served as they have in the past, but even more critically, to ensure that we are well served in the future as we go through these very difficult times.

The April budget extended and deepened the spending reductions that flowed from last December's economic statement. Together these measures will give us

about $7.5 billion in savings over the next five years in government operations.

A key element of this spending restraint package is the freeze on employees' salaries for the next two years. Currently salaries account for about 55 per cent of the operating costs of the federal government.

The total employment in the Public Service is expected to drop by 16,500 by the year 1997–98 in order to accommodate the needs of the budget restraint. A good portion of this reduction will be handled through retirements and resignations. Nobody on this side of the House wants to create hardship for the many valuable public servants who have served us so well over the years.

Even though we are going to try to do what we can through attrition and through these measures, unfortunately there is no doubt that some people will find themselves looking for some other kind of work. That is one of the sad things, but it is true.

The government will have to provide services, no question about it, with fewer staff in a climate of very rapid change. That means that the way we do things has to change. Doing things the same old way is just no longer possible. We must find innovative new ways. We must be adaptable. We must be flexible.

Those are the things that will be essential to ensure that we can cope with the challenges of the very real budgetary restraints that all governments in Canada face.

That brings me to my second point. There are instruments available for managing change in this new, leaner Public Service that is currently under development. One of them is the initiative to reform the Public Service known as PS 2000. That has been an important step toward equipping managers to be more innovative, flexible and accountable. As the hon. member has just pointed out it is an issue that is necessary in a democratic society.

• (1805)

In this initiative managers have been given greater flexibility and more authority as well as responsibility and accountability for their decisions. They have more freedom to deploy staff. That makes it possible to make practical decisions rather than bureaucratically-driven decisions. This means that decision making has moved down to the shop floor and that we are reducing layers of management when it comes to making some small but essential decisions in order to move the business of government along in a very efficient way. It also helps to remove some constraints that in the past have had the tendency to stifle creativity which then creates some job dissatisfaction. Obviously out of that flows ineffectiveness.

There are other benefits as well to PS 2000, but I want to focus now on operating budgets to illustrate the kind of change that is taking place in the Public Service. Change is needed for us to meet these challenges that are being created by the very necessary budget restraints that must happen in the next few years.

Operating budgets were implemented across the Public Service on April 1 of this year. There are some very fundamental and interesting changes. Under this operating budget approach managers will receive a set amount of money for the year to cover wages, operating expenditures and minor capital expenses. Operating expenditures would include utilities, materials, supplies, goods and services and the kinds of things they would generally have to purchase in the orderly conduct of their business. Some minor capital items might include furnishings, machinery or other equipment needed to operate an efficient administration.

This may not seem like much to you, Mr. Speaker, but this really is a significant change in the federal Public Service. To get a feeling for what kind of change this is and what it means, I think we should look back for a moment at the way things used to be done.

Since 1970 the Treasury Board has controlled the number of person years and the amounts of salary dollars that departments are entitled to. A person year for those who do not know is the equivalent of employing one person for one full year. It is one of the ways we measure productivity and employment activity here in Ottawa.

When the government started to reduce the work force in 1985 person-year controls really made it difficult to respond to the demands for cost-recovered services because a very structured and bureaucratic system had been set up. It was also an impediment to joint initiatives with the private sector, so clearly we needed to be more

flexible in our approach to doing the business of government.

The value of operating budgets is that managers will now look at the total cost of providing a program or service and not just the person years involved. The amount of money received will no longer depend on the number of people in a department. Managers will now have to use the measurement in a more business–like, productive and effective manner. They will be able to decide what the best mix of human and other resources will be to get the job done.

Those are the kinds of thoughtful decisions that have to be brought to bear on the business of government if we are going to achieve the goals we have set for ourselves and the even tougher goals that may be set for us in the coming years.

This means we will have increased efficiency and most importantly, and I say this to my hon. friend who has just finished speaking, increased accountability because I think he is quite right. Accountability must go hand in hand with authority or there is no hope for the people.

Managers will also be asked to focus their thinking on cost effectiveness and not just slash and burn cost effectiveness because nobody benefits from that. There must be very carefully thought out methods of reducing the cost of the Public Service and ensuring that the operations of government are managed in a way that gives the best value for the tax dollar invested by each of the taxpayers. That should ultimately reduce the over–all cost of government.

Perhaps if the Public Service is totally and fully committed to this, as I know it is, it will help us find ways to reduce programs or perhaps even do away with programs without doing any harm to the citizens of this country who expect their tax dollars to be spent wisely and well.

• (1810)

Mr. Speaker, I think you will see that this is one way we can approach government to make the budget go a little bit further in a way that does not create any tremendous pain for any particular group. The framework for this is largely in place and we should see a new, creative and more effective management developing over the next few years.

I just want to turn briefly to another point and that is the quality of our Public Service, managers and employees. I must say that in my experience here for the past five years and based on a reference point of my experience in the private sector for over 20 years, I have to commend many of our public servants who do a tremendous job. They are very dedicated and committed to the people of Canada and to being professionals and providing a professional service.

I know it is difficult for many people in the Public Service right now. So many things are changing and the opportunity to look forward to a lifetime steady job with some security is no longer as available to us as it once was. For people in the Public Service this is a very large change. I think it creates some strong sense of instability and perhaps in some cases even fear.

I believe we should commend all the members of the Public Service for the work they have done and the way they have conducted themselves through these difficult times when there is so much insecurity all around us. I know they have shared in the sacrifices that all Canadians are making and have had to make in order to bring the budget deficit into line. Perhaps we will have to make even more sacrifices in the future as we begin to tackle the deficit and make sure we do away with it completely.

The Public Service has shown imagination and ingenuity in this challenging period and I am very proud to mention some recent examples. For example, there is an award for innovative management that has been created by the Institute of Public Administration and Coopers and Lybrand. For the first time, perhaps because of these new attitudes that are being generated, the federal government Public Service was among the finalists. The departments of fisheries and oceans and supply and services were selected as two of the five finalists for their very creative and innovative ideas and their new approaches to doing things in a more efficient manner. I think that points to the commitment and dedication of these people to making sure the dollars we have are spent in the most effective way and their understanding that these are difficult times for everybody.

Last year in this House we passed legislation creating National Public Service Week, so we do appreciate the work that public servants do. During that week in mid–June Canadians will have an opportunity to recognize the accomplishments of Public Service employees. I want to commend all Public Service employees for the

great dedication with which they have served their country and this government over the past number of years.

The main estimates before the House are tangible proof of the government's serious approach to financial management. Although we have managed to take a very large chunk out of the deficit, particularly with regard to the operating deficit which has been turned around in the past nine years, there is still a great deal to do.

Perhaps now more than ever before Canadians are willing to help us do this because attitudes have changed immeasurably over the last few years. I think people now understand they have a say and should be saying what they believe governments should be doing, rather than perhaps being the passive recipients of programs and expenditures created by politicians for interests that may not be entirely beneficial to the general public.

I think people also know that we now have to separate what we want from what we need because there is no more money left for the kinds of luxuries we allowed ourselves over the past two decades. I would say in pointing this out that we have all been responsible and not just any particular government or regime. The world has been on a spending spree for a couple of decades and now it is time to pay the piper. I believe Canadians are telling us in no uncertain terms they are ready. They understand that tough decisions must be made to get the deficit wiped clean from the slate and put the operating surplus to work creating funds that will create choices for people in the future.

• (1815)

So these main estimates are a very good step in the right direction and obviously are one of the first steps in the second phase of this government's plan to turn around the economy of Canada and make it viable and vibrant to ensure that Canadians have future choices available to them.

I think the next step will be a preparation in our own minds, as one of my colleagues across the way said in an earlier speech this afternoon, to critically examine every single thing we do and every single penny we spend. I think all our programs and expenditures must be put to some acid tests and they are quite simply: Does this program deliver the kind of benefit that it was expected it would deliver to Canadians? Is there a measurable benefit from this expenditure or not? Does the program provide full value for the money that is being expended? Frequently there are programs in place and after a few years one wonders why they are still operating but it is politically difficult to perhaps make the decision to stop them.

Finally, is this something we really need or is it just something somebody wants in terms of expenditure? Programs that cannot meet that acid test or expenditures that do not meet that acid test will have to be ended if we are really going to get serious about dealing with this deficit.

In a year from now I hope that I will be standing here dealing with the main estimates and saying that because of the good work that was done in 1993 we are now able to proceed with the next step and take even larger chunks out of the deficit and bring more rationalization to government. One of the ways that we can do this of course is by changing the way we do things now. We have to be prepared to take an absolutely critical look not just at what we are spending but at how we are spending money. Perhaps we should take a look at the way government operates and be prepared to make some structural changes to bring some rational thinking to bear on the way government operates.

I believe that there is also a greater role for members of Parliament, as one of my colleagues opposite also said earlier this afternoon, to be involved in this critical examination of government expenditure. It seems to me that every member in this House should find one of his most important tasks to be the critical examination of government expenditures and helping the policy makers and the cabinet to discover the kinds of changes that need to be made in the coming budget processes.

Obviously that is what we are here for. We are here to ensure that Canadians get full value for their dollars. Part of our job is to act as a watch-dog over government expenditures and to ensure that the money being spent is for Canadian priorities and not just for the priorities of some politicians.

We must also be careful to examine not just where our dollars are spent but how we spend them. Are they being spent in the most cost efficient manner? When somebody puts together a set of specifications for public works or for some other product we are buying are those specifications based on what is cost effective and will do the job or are they based on some other criteria that does not respond to the public need right now? I think there

are dollars to be shaved off in the way we spend money as well as where we spend it.

Finally we must be prepared to question the *status quo* in absolutely every area. I think we can learn a great deal by looking at something like the New Zealand model where in fact it was understood that unless some major structural changes took place to government that that government would go into bankruptcy. One of the things it did was to shave off 11 per cent of its operating costs in one year by setting up a contract between a minister and his deputy. That contract was based on the ability to deliver productivity throughout the year rather than to meet a budget target that might have been set artificially or had grown over the years because of artificial cost of living criteria.

I will close by saying that we have to be flexible and we have to be imaginative. Our managers and our management have to be the same way. I am pleased with what I see already and I am convinced that Canadians will expect more in the coming years and that they will continue to be well served.

• (1820)

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that the member for Winnipeg South agrees that one of the important issues is accountability. Maybe I could add stewardship which I think I mentioned in my speech a few minutes ago. By stewardship I mean the action of elected officials to judiciously examine every expenditure made against the capability or the capacity of Canadians to pay. I think that has to be made more public and more prevalent in our system.

I would like to make one comment on Public Service 2000 on which my friend from Winnipeg South made some remarks. I agree that the objective to give managers more powers to manage is a reasonably good objective. The difficulty with that is that there is absolutely no accountability to Parliament by managers. In Public Service 2000 if there is one weakness in the whole system it is that managers will have more powers but they will not be accountable to the elected representatives of this House for the use of that power. I find that to be a weak link in the whole system.

I want to ask my Progressive Conservative friend a question about something that was suggested in this House which I alluded to in my remarks and that is the need for more concerted efforts of all levels of federal, provincial and municipal governments to co-operate and to meet regularly to discuss this over-all national debt that we have to face.

As she knows, her government has off-loaded a lot of responsibilities—if I may use that word—onto provincial authorities and they in turn have off-loaded onto municipal authorities. It could be social welfare programs or housing or whatever.

I want to ask her if she would agree with the idea of having a federal-provincial-municipal conference-the large cities with the provinces and the federal government—to come to grips with the magnitude of the deficit. I am told the deficit is close to $575 billion. That is the total of federal, provincial, and municipal debt right now. We are accumulating debt at a rapid pace across this country.

I think there is a clock in Vancouver that ticks at some $63,000 every minute. It comes to about $100 million a day. In 10 days there is $1 billion added to the debt. The compound interest on the debt—paid interest on interest—is one of the difficult problems we have to face.

I am asking her specifically if she would support such an initiative, for example calling a tripartite federal-provincial-municipal conference to discuss our debt problems and how to address them.

Mrs. Dobbie: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my hon. colleague. I think that is an innovative thought to bring all three levels of government together. I know that certainly today, although the federal government collects the most in taxes over all because we have the most people to tax there is no question that the second largest level of government is the municipal level. Cities have become the dwelling places of many Canadians and they have huge administrative problems.

The member is right. When one level of government says that there will not be any more increases the next level of government passes that down and there is always somebody at the end that gets squeezed and it is generally the cities.

I would agree that to bring people together to deal with this issue in a non-partisan way with the same goal is going to be helpful, but I think it is a short term solution. That should not mean that we should not do this. I think it is an excellent idea.

I do believe that we need to go one step further. This is not something new that has just happened to us. This has been around for a long time. Because we have three levels of government we tend to forget that there is only one taxpayer and there is a lot of competition between those levels of government and the taxpayer usually ends up carrying the can on this.

I think part of the reason for that is because this is a federation and we have to deal with it but nevertheless that does not mean to say that we cannot find some long term solutions.

I would go one step further from what my hon. colleague has suggested to say that I think we must set up a mechanism in this country to systematically deal with these budget issues, but more to deal with the dismantling of trade barriers and to deal with the negotiation of national standards in education and health and on labour mobility on a very wide front. I think it is the responsibility of the federal government to take the leadership in doing that.

• (1825)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Nic Leblanc (Longueuil): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Winnipeg South gave a lengthy explanation of what the government has done and that it has talked with public servants to obtain agreements to cut government spending and program spending in order to improve the financial situation.

In the latest budget tabled on April 26, 1993 on page 19, if we look at program spending, for example, we see that the government did not decrease program spending but increased it. From 1992-93 to 1993-94 the increase is about $3.1 billion. The next year, the increase is again $3.1 billion. In 1995-96 it is $1.5 billion. This means that over the next five years, although the hon. member tells us that arrangements have been made to improve management and to lower program spending, it goes up by about $12.5 billion. That is not peanuts; it is billions of dollars, a $12.5 billion increase in program spending. The hon. member would have us believe that spending has been cut, but the opposite is true.

The government claims that it can lower the deficit, but it is doing so by raising revenues and not by cutting spending. It will raise its revenues by over $41 billion in the next five years. Where will it get the money? From the taxpayers' pockets again. Canada is already bankrupt. How do you think it will get $41 billion more in the next five years?

I do not know where the hon. member got her information, but I am getting mine right from her government's document, the one from the Minister of Finance dated April 26, 1993. Even worse, at the same time as it increases spending and revenues, the federal government continues to cut transfers to the provinces. It provides less service than before. As the member for Ottawa—Vanier said earlier, the provinces are forced to pass their deficit on to the municipalities. Despite all that, the government will continue to spend even more and thus increase its deficit. That seems rather unrealistic.

That is why I asked the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier if he thought he had found the miracle solution, thinking that public servants would cut spending. No way! The government does not have the will to really run the country. In the budget we see that spending is still being allowed to rise instead of—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): In all fairness I must give the floor to the hon. member for Winnipeg South.

[*English*]

Mrs. Dobbie: Mr. Speaker, I think my colleague and friend has made some very good points.

It says in the budget, and the spending estimates reflect this, that we expect to increase expenditures by 1.5 per cent each year. I guess the argument we would have is should expenditures increase at all? Some people are saying that all expenditures should be frozen at 1993 levels and I think a very good case could be made for that.

My friend also asked a question as to where the revenues are going to come from to cover the increase of some $12.5 billion he has added up according to last year's budget. They will not come from the taxpayers. At least not in this budget. They will come from the growth in the economy we projected to be around 2.9 per cent.

That is a fairly reasonable projection when some economists are suggesting our economy will grow by 3.5 per cent to 4 per cent over the next few years.

I absolutely agree with the hon. member that we must be very careful not to increase the cost of programs and not to add new programs at a time when people are crying out for us to reduce the over-all cost of government and to get rid of the deficit and begin working on the debt.

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, it is not an issue of innovation as the member for—

• (1830)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): I would appreciate it if the hon. member would indicate to the Chair whether he will be splitting his time.

Mr. Caccia: Mr. Speaker, I understand there were indications we are splitting the time.

I submit that it is not a matter of innovation and flexibility as the hon. member for Winnipeg South has attempted to convince her audience to believe it is for debate here today.

If you review the performance of this government which this bill allows us to do today, in its request for funds the issue before us today is an issue of broken promises. It is an issue of broken faith. It is a matter of a government which preaches one way and acts in a completely different manner.

Let me give some examples to illustrate this. This government, when speaking abroad particularly, expresses great concern on certain issues. For instance on the issue of climate change, the Government of Canada in Bergen three years ago, in Geneva two years ago and in Rio last year, said that this question of climate change is a top priority.

As we speak here today, having made these grandiose statements abroad, there is no plan yet before us, no matter how the minister of state for the environment camouflaged today in Question Period her answers, on how Canada will stabilize let alone reduce carbon dioxide emissions.

Take biodiversity. Canada goes abroad and claims its full commitment to protect biodiversity. When the first issue comes up in Canada on the question of the protection of biodiversity, in the Clayoquot area on the west coast, there is not one word from the ministerial benches of this government. Total silence.

Therefore the future of Clayoquot is seen by decisions by the provinces whereby the government knows very well that the Clayoquot forest could be made part of the Pacific Rim National Park and therefore an extension of an already existing federal presence in terms of protection of biodiversity.

Take the major flop in fisheries. We go abroad. We agree to hold conferences. But when it comes to cod and the protection of our fisheries offshore and beyond the 200-mile limit, all we can agree upon and all we can show a muscle on is to agree to have another conference.

Take forestry where we are more concerned about public relations in Europe than in improving our cutting practices. Take sustainable agriculture where the review on the reform of pesticides policies has been completely ignored by this government despite a very fine set of recommendations produced by a commission two years ago.

Take the question of aid to developing countries. One year ago in Rio this government pledged to increase its aid to .7 per cent of its gross national product. What does it do eights months later at home? It reduces aid. Not only does it reduce aid but it reduces aid to the poorest of the poorest countries; to Tanzania, Rwanda, Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda, Madagascar, Burundi. Not only that but it also turns CIDA, the Canadian International Development Agency, into a self-serving commercial agency. What hypocrisy if you compare the statements of this government with its actions.

Let us turn our attention to the domestic scene.

• (1835)

The government professes its desire to strengthen Canadian unity and what does it do? It produces the ill-fated Meech Lake agreement. Not having learned from that experience, it produces the Charlottetown agreement. Thank God the majority of Canadians saw through that smoke and mirrors and shot it down in flames. This government at home promises jobs. How does that jibe with 11 per cent unemployment? How does it jibe with increasing numbers of young people coming out of our educational institutions? They are facing years of unemployment because there is not one opportunity to find a job because the government is cutting its programs. It is cutting employment opportuni-

ties. It is not creating jobs for the young people who are coming onstream in the labour market.

At home this government promised the sacred trust for our social security system. Yet it did not take it long to start cutting social spending in reducing and almost virtually suspending social housing. I will go into that a little bit later if time permits me in outlining the findings of the United Nations human rights committee that has just produced a study on Canada's performance in relation to human rights in relation to poverty, social spending, the phenomenon of food banks and the homeless. I will come back to that if time permits.

This government professes and proclaims that it will abide by its own environmental impact assessments. Yet it adopts policies which run counter to the recommendations made by the environmental impact assessment panels on the Oldman Dam, Rafferty–Alameda, Pearson International Airport and the latest, brightest idea, namely the link with Prince Edward Island which I will refrain to comment on because of lack of time and because I do not want to be sidetracked from the major items before us. I will say that it is one with the most asinine proposals that has ever come across the floor of this House of Commons.

On free trade, this government having proclaimed to respect the will of the majority, having come out of the 1988 election with a majority of seats in the House of Commons but with a minority of popular votes on the side of the Progressive Conservatives with the majority of the combined votes for the Liberal and the NDP Party expressing their opposition to the free trade agreement, proceeded and adopted it. Flowing from that, of course, now we have the NAFTA which is being rammed through in the fifth year of this Parliament when the mandate has run out and even before an agreement has been finalized by both the governments of the United States and Mexico.

This government has strangled provincial budgets. It has cancelled the Court Challenges Program, the Economic Council of Canada, the Science Council of Canada, the Institute for International Relations, the Ocean Institute and the Law Reform Commission. As I mentioned earlier, this government has suffocated the activity of the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation. It has fought unemployment on the backs of those who receive unemployment insurance by reducing benefits. It has shown a lack of attention to federal–provincial agreements. For instance, the agreement between Canada and Ontario has not been renewed since 1991. It has reduced rail transport despite all its commitments to improve transportation and energy ratios.

This government, despite its commitments in theory to improve environmental standards and performance, has an energy policy which, if one were to be charitable at the most, fits in the 19th century. It continues to provide subsidies for outdated megaprojects and engages in outdated energy policies. This government has deformed the Canadian tax system, changing it from a progressive system into a regressive one by imposing a number of sales taxes which affect more the lower incomes than the higher incomes. The tax system today in Canada is a disgrace. It is making the rich richer and the poor poorer.

• (1840)

An hon. member: Not true.

Mr. Caccia: The minister says: "Not true". I challenge him to rise in the House and give us evidence to the contrary. It is a sham what has become of Canada under the Tory legislation in the last eight and a half years. In the government's dying days it is incumbent upon us to put these matters on record when it is seeking money for its functioning until 1994. By that time this government will no longer be in power.

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, my friend from Davenport always makes good sense and always addresses the issue of environmental questions with a lot of vigour and conviction.

He mentioned a report of the United Nations dealing with poverty, homelessness and food banks. I would like to hear him comment on the relationship between the report of the United Nations on human rights and Canadian poverty, homelessness and food banks.

Mr. Caccia: Mr. Speaker, I am extremely grateful to the member for Ottawa—Vanier for raising this question. Certainly it is important to put on record the views of an independent, neutral body that has studied the situation in Canada among other things. I am going to read from the document itself. Under the heading

"Principal Subjects of Concern" and referring to financial resources and the like it stated:

—considering Canada's enviable situation with regard to such resources, the Committee expresses concern about the persistence of poverty in Canada. There seems to have been no measurable progress in alleviating poverty for the last decade, nor in alleviating the severity of poverty among a number of particularly vulnerable groups.

The next item stated:

—the Committee is concerned about the fact that, according to information available to it, more than half of the single mothers in Canada, as well as a large number of children, live in poverty.

It referred to the Progressive Conservative Party and stated:

The State party has not outlined any new or planned measures to remedy this situation. Of particular concern to the committee is the fact that the federal government appears to have reduced the ratio of its contributions to cost sharing agreements for social assistance.

We know that. The next item stated:

The Committee received information from non-governmental organizations about families being forced to relinquish their children to foster care because of inability to provide adequate housing or other necessities.

This is how we look abroad. It further stated:

The committee is concerned that there seems to exist no procedure to ensure that those who must depend entirely on welfare payments do not thereby derive an income which is at or above the poverty line.

The next item dealt with food banks, as the hon. member already hinted at:

A further subject of concern for the Committee is the evidence of hunger in Canada and the reliance on food banks operated by charitable organizations.

I wish members from the Conservative Party were still here to hear that. I quote again from the same document:

The Committee learned from non-governmental organizations of widespread discrimination in housing against people with children, people on social assistance, people with low incomes, and people who are indebted. Although prohibited by law in many of Canada's provinces, those forms of discrimination are apparently common. A more concerted effort to eliminate such practices would therefore seem to be in order.

The next item was:

The Committee notes the omission from the Government's written report and oral presentation of any mention of the problems of homelessness.

The Committee regretted that there were no figures available from the Government on the extent of homelessness, on the number of persons evicted annually throughout the country, on the lengths of waiting lists or the percentage of houses accessible to people with disabilities.

• (1845)

The next one was:

Given the evidence of homelessness and inadequate living conditions, the Committee is surprised that expenditures on social housing are as low as 1.3 per cent of government expenditures.

It continued:

The Committee is concerned that in some court decisions and in recent constitutional discussions, social and economic rights have been described as mere "policy objectives" of governments rather than as fundamental human rights.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): The time for questions or comments has now expired.

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I appreciated my colleague's comments. He drew to our attention the government's failure with respect to social programs by quoting a neutral third source, not opposition parties, talking about inadequacies in terms of health, food and homes. He also pointed out the inadequacies and the failings of the government with respect to living up to its commitments in the area of the environment, controlling the deficit, the debt, and the creation of jobs. It is really unfortunate he did not have more time, for which I am partially responsible because we are splitting the time.

I want to talk not only about the government's failings but about the performance of the government. For the past nine years the Conservatives have shamelessly promoted themselves as the masters of economic policy. The image however is at odds with reality. As recent counts show the economic record of the Conservative government has been one of unremitting disaster.

On April 14 the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops released a report condemning the high level of unemployment that continues to plague Canada. A few days later Canadians received news of an International

Monetary Fund report stating that future economic growth could stall due to the Tories' inability to control the deficit. Each in its own right is a condemnation of the Conservative stewardship of the Canadian economy.

The Catholic bishops' report said: "Widespread unemployment is a gaping wound in Canadian society". Urging the government to assume responsibility over the problems of unemployment, the report states: "As long as job creation is not a firm priority in Canada our current social crisis will only worsen".

These are the kinds of messages that the Catholic bishops were sharing with this government, with political parties generally, and with Canadians. With 1.6 million Canadians unemployed and a further 2.3 million Canadians underemployed it is clear a solution to this problem is not a priority to the Tories. If it is they have failed miserably. Moreover the unemployment problem is largely the result of the Conservatives' misguided fiscal policy, a poor mix of programs that has stifled economic growth and seriously reduced job opportunities.

In its report on Canada's fiscal situation the International Monetary Fund told the government to get its house in order. The report suggests that the federal deficit and our growing debt pose serious problems to the strength of the Canadian dollar and as a result could undermine our already fitful recovery from the recession, fitful recovery because it is up and down; it is not consistent.

The IMF's cautionary tale is one the government has heard many times before. Judging by its performance up to and including its latest budget, it is one that it is unable to act upon, to hear or to understand. Over the past almost nine years the Conservative governments have forgotten that their priority is to reduce the deficit. They have run up annual deficits of over $30 billion. The problem is clear. This is a government that does not practise what it preaches or, if it does, it is unable to do what it wants. This is a government that is prepared to spend over a number of years $5.8 billion on cold war style helicopters and willingly approve, I might add, an aimless tour of Europe by a Prime Minister with some time on his hands who wants to make sure he does not get in the way of the leadership race or embarrass anyone, at a cost to Canadian taxpayers of $50,000 per day.

• (1850)

Because of the Conservatives' inability to control the deficit our debt according to the IMF will rise to $553 billion by 1996–97 or $55 billion higher than the government had forecast in its 1992 budget; not $55 million but $55 billion or $55,000,000,000 more than it had forecast in 1992. Yet accuracy in budgets has never been its strong suit. After nine years of Conservative fiscal insights that were misguided and unrelenting promises to reduce the burden, the debt has increased from almost $168 billion to nearly $460 billion.

When the Conservative leadership hopefuls, the Minister of the Environment, the Minister of National Defence and others say they will get rid of the deficit in four or five years, no one is being fooled; no one believes them. I will quote Jeffrey Simpson of *The Globe and Mail*. It is a particularly pertinent and insightful quotation with respect to the Minister of the Environment, the Minister of National Defence and others saying that they could get the deficit and the debt under control in four or five years. Mr. Simpson said: "The candidates served up bromides and illusions". He added: "A promise to slay the deficit monster in four or five years is an implicit admission of failure".

Only one thing is clear. Canadians can no longer afford the high cost of Conservative economics. Change is required. In short, Canadians need a government and a leader with the vision and the knowledge to get the Canadian economy back on its feet.

The objective of the Liberal government will be to reduce the deficit substantially as a percentage of the gross domestic product from 5.2 per cent to 3 per cent and to shrink the public debt as a percentage of the gross domestic productivity. Meeting this objective will require sound management, unwavering discipline in our expenditures, tough choices and, above all, new priorities.

[*Translation*]

The present situation is a clear indication that the government's budget and estimates are not doing a thing to meet the needs of Canadians today. At this very moment, 11.6 per cent of Canadian men and women who want to work are unemployed. They say nearly 3 million people, 2.2 million people, will get their food from food banks this year, and 2.7 million will be on welfare. Nearly five million people are living below the poverty line.

Most are women and more than one million are children.

In 1984 when this government came to power the debt was a little less than $168 billion. The government said it was going to control the deficit and the debt. At the time the deficit was over $30 billion. Since then, there has been a deficit every year, with one exception I believe, but even then there were some doubts, because it went over $30 billion. The debt which was nearly $168 billion now stands at $468 billion. Obviously their policies are not working.

We must not forget that when the government talks about expenditure control it never says it transferred its expenditures to the provinces, which have done the same to the municipalities, universities, colleges and hospitals. So this is not a responsible approach.

• (1855)

It seems my time is running out. That is too bad because there is a lot more I wanted to say. Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will agree it is high time we had an election, elected a new government and tried new policies that provide an innovative response to the real problems of Canadians. What are those real problems? Well, the first one is job creation, to give some hope to Canadians who feel utterly lost and think the country is out of control and the government is not working, or working very badly. I am now ready for questions.

[*English*]

I thank you and I am now willing to entertain questions.

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I would start with a few remarks about the nature of supply. Supply is an ancient and honourable term for the procedure by which the government is supplied with money in order to carry out its programs and do the things governments do.

This is the last day for the main estimates but I think it is also an opportunity to reflect on how insignificant the whole issue of supply has become in the House of Commons. At one time that was one of the main functions of the House of Commons and of course in theory it still is. It goes all the way back to the Magna Carta when the king could not raise taxes or spend money without the permission of Parliament.

Up until 1969, and it still exists in some legislatures in Canada, the government had to bring all its estimates before the entire House of Commons. If the opposition was in the mood it could make cabinet ministers answer questions down to the last detail of their expenditures. Members of Parliament were able to find out a great deal of detail and were also able to put a considerable degree of pressure on cabinet ministers. It was a time when members of Parliament were able to get certain things done for their constituents in return for speedy passage of estimates or whatever.

That practice ceased to exist in 1969 when the Liberal government of the day imposed a series of reforms unilaterally and not by consensus. One of those reforms was that the estimates would be considered by committee. When I first came here that was still a reasonably lively element of what went on around here although it certainly had its limitations. In the spring ministers would appear before committees to answer for their estimates and of course it would be a time when they would also have to answer for any other matters that came within their jurisdiction.

The press used to attend these meetings and it was an opportunity to see an exchange between the opposition members or for that matter government backbenchers and cabinet ministers about government policy and expenditures. Then of course the estimates were deemed to be passed by a certain date in any event.

To a great extent this has fallen out of favour and practice. Even when it was being practised more routinely than it is now the ministers always knew they had to put up with the meetings. They knew there was no chance the estimates were not going to be approved. They knew the committee could not really change the estimates. So it was just a matter of killing time until the questioner used up his or her time or the minister, as was often the case, used up the questioner's time. I am sure the member remembers when the minister would just take up time with the questioner, the 10 minutes would expire and that would be it. The scrutiny of the estimates would be over.

• (1900)

I was the health critic for a while in the early 1980s. The budget for health and welfare was in the billions and billions of dollars and I had 10 minutes to question the Minister of National Health and Welfare on that and

maybe another 10 minutes if I was lucky and could schedule another meeting.

One of the problems we have is that this whole notion of supply, accountability and examination of the estimates is not as significant or meaningful as it was even a short while ago and even then it was not as significant and meaningful as it was early on.

That is not my main purpose this evening. My main purpose is to talk a little bit about the general economic and financial situation the government finds itself in and has put the country in. There is a great deal of debate everywhere about the question of deficits and debt.

I want to submit tonight that to speak about this problem without going to the heart of the matter—and I will try to explain what I mean by the heart of the matter—is to fundamentally mislead Canadians about what has been going on for the last 15 to 20 years.

A deficit can come about in a number of ways. It can be created by spending beyond a certain steady level of income. There can be a steady level of spending and if measures are taken that have the effect of reducing revenues, the result is a deficit. The government is very fond of giving Canadians the impression that the deficit is the result of overspending on such things as social programs for instance.

I want to submit to you tonight that the deficit is not caused by overspending on social programs because if we look at spending on social programs in relation to over-all spending, the GDP and a number of other things, it has not grown in the way the government wants Canadians to believe. A series of governments going back to the Liberal governments in the 1970s have successively and systematically forfeited the revenues that might otherwise have come to the Government of Canada through various tax measures.

When we talk about debt and deficits, it is important to have a sense of history. It is important to know that as far back as 1972, the NDP through its leader at that time, David Lewis, was calling attention to the fact that the public treasury was then being built by the corporations. In 1972 the campaign slogan of the NDP was "Corporate Welfare Bums". It was trying to call attention to the fact that some of us spend a lot of time worrying about what ordinary people who are forced onto social assistance might be getting for nothing and not worrying at all about what the corporations are getting in the form of government assistance.

So often it seems that the kind of system we have here is a kind of socialism for the rich and capitalism for the poor. The rich are lined up at the public trough without apology because, of course, when they want money it is just to create a good business climate or it is an incentive.

• (1905)

It is not welfare but a corporate incentive. When ordinary people need money just to get food to eat that is welfare, pejoratively understood and pejoratively spoken about. When the corporations manage to be on the receiving end of public money, public assistance, then that is called an incentive. As far back as 1972 the NDP was calling attention to what we then called corporate welfare bums. Corporate welfare bum-ism has reached new heights since David Lewis first called attention to it in 1972.

In 1972 we still had not had a number of the Liberal budgets of the 1970s which, if the truth were told, were responsible in large part for the deficit. They were not entirely responsible because we cannot discount the high interest rate policies of the early 1980s and a number of other things. We cannot discount the fact that the current government has not seen fit to close a lot of those tax loopholes. If we are trying to develop an historical perspective we have to go back to those Liberal budgets in the 1970s, budgets that were wrongly predicated on a vision of never-ending growth, on a vision of our economy as an economy that would never sputter.

Joe Greene, a Liberal Minister of Energy at one point, predicted that there would be oil for 500 or 600 years. It is symptomatic of the age that despite warnings from groups like the Club of Rome and others that things were not as rosy as governments of the day thought it was our policies were based on this fallacy that there could be, and this fallacy is still prevalent today in many forms, an economy based on the need for infinite growth in a finite world. That is a problem that in some sense I do not think any party has come to terms with.

This will be a problem as long as we have models of economic growth or economic activity which presuppose that there must be a certain kind of growth in order for good things to happen, in order for the poor not to be poor. The hope that people invest in growth is that if we get enough growth then the poor will somehow become not poor without the rich having to share, that growth will somehow solve the moral problem that is at the root of our economy.

We will always and will increasingly have an even more serious problem with the poor, not only in our own country but globally speaking, unless we face up to this flaw in our way of thinking, unless we face up to the fact that we are not going to be able to feed, clothe and shelter the entire world frugally unless somebody who has a lot gives something up. That is a difficult question for people to face.

Going back to the historical overview of the deficit-debt problem, it seems to me that we laid the foundations for our current deficit-debt problem in the 1970s when we had these unwarranted expectations. We then had the high interest rate policies of the early 1980s. Although that may have been in some way related to a larger global situation it was nevertheless a fact that the exceedingly high interest rates that we had here in Canada in the early 1980s were self-inflicted. It was a policy choice.

You may argue, Mr. Speaker, that it was absolutely necessary. You certainly did not argue that at the time, but you might argue it now. However these are policy choices that have been made by Canadian governments. Those high interest rates at that time, according to a Statistics Canada study released a year and a half or so ago, are 50 per cent responsible for the debt that we have.

• (1910)

Social programs were only 6 per cent responsible and 44 per cent was a result of revenue forgone as a result of tax expenditures, tax loopholes, shelters or whatever we want to call them.

In 1979 the Conservative government of the member for Yellowhead released a tax expenditure account. It was the first time that this had been done. If I remember the figures correctly, at that time it showed that for 1979, perhaps it was 1978, the total tax expenditure account, taxes not collected by the Government of Canada, was $32 billion. That year the deficit was $14 billion.

The money the government did not collect in 1979 was twice the deficit for that year plus $4 billion. Not all tax expenditures are bad things. Into the tax expenditure account went the child tax credit and various other things. It is not as if all tax expenditures are intrinsically evil or something like that.

The fact is that over the years that has piled up. A lot of those tax expenditures were needless tax expenditures. They were tax expenditures that were basically give-aways to the corporate culture in this country, the members of whom are very good at criticizing others when they are on the receiving end of public moneys but not so good at scrutinizing themselves when it comes to the way in which they receive assistance from the public treasury. They like to call them incentives rather than welfare.

This is the root of the problem. We have a revenue crisis in this country, not a debt crisis. The debt is a symptom of the larger problem of the revenue crisis created by some of the things that I have talked about here. I have not had time to go into the detail of it.

The revenue crisis is further complicated by unemployment. When we have policies that deliberately create unemployment we increase our revenue problem by removing people from the tax rolls and putting them on UI or welfare. There are a variety of ways in which people who are not working cost the country a lot of money. There is no willingness on the government side to recognize this.

High unemployment helps drive high public debt. Unemployment is not free. One estimate we are aware of shows that in 1992 each unemployed worker cost the federal government an average of $2,200 in forgone income tax, $730 in reduced federal sales taxes, $730 in forgone pension and UI contributions, $6,700 in unemployment insurance benefits claimed and $2,300 in the federal share of new welfare claims.

Each unemployed worker costs provincial or territorial governments $1,150 in forgone income tax, $850 in reduced provincial sales taxes and $2,800 in the provincial share of new welfare claims. That is an example of what I am talking about and why we say that the root cause of the problem is forgone revenue and policies which deliberately create unemployment or tolerate

unemployment in the name of some other economic goal.

We are not going to solve our fiscal problems until we are committed to solving them, not through the current kind of policies that the government is following but through the creation of employment.

That is why we brought forward a jobs plan. That is why we have agreed with so many others across this country who have called for a municipal infrastructure program to get Canadians working, building and doing the kinds of things that we need for our future.

• (1915)

It is not a question of spending so much as it is a question of investment in Canada's future. That would be money spent wisely and it would be money spent in a way that would enable these Canadians who are actually a drain on the public treasury to become once again a boon to the public treasury.

Ms. Mary Clancy (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a great pleasure for me to rise in this House today to put a question to my hon. friend and colleague, the member for Winnipeg Transcona. On the last supply day of this current session we are dealing with a figure somewhere in the realm of $161 billion. We are looking at a country in crisis. We are particularly looking at a crisis in the provinces and the municipalities of this country because of the way in which this debt has been off-loaded by this government on to provincial and municipal governments.

I know that my hon. friend from Winnipeg Transcona has great sympathy for provincial governments, and probably in particular for those governments in Ontario, which Heaven knows needs our sympathy, Saskatchewan and British Columbia. It has been advocated today by numerous members of the Liberal Party who have spoken in this debate that a tri-level conference of federal, provincial and municipal governments be convened to deal with a number of the problems that this off-loading of the debt has created.

I would consequently ask my hon. colleague from Winnipeg Transcona if he and his party would agree with this idea as it is one measure with which to clarify, deal with and receive the contribution from those various levels of government. Some people have merely agreed upon provincial input but, coming as I do from Atlantic Canada, we are prepared to say, shocking as it may be to some, that the questions that arise from the problems of Toronto with over two million people are at least as important as those that arise in Prince Edward Island with approximately 125,000 people. I would ask for the hon. member's comments on this suggestion by the Liberal Party.

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not see any harm and I can see a lot of potential merit in the idea of having such a conference. However it would have to be a conference that was attended by the federal government with an open mind because part of the problem is that they are not short of representations made to them in the past and just recently by provincial governments and municipalities. It is a good idea but it may be that this government has passed the point where it will listen.

The municipalities have repeatedly called for spending on the municipal infrastructure in this country. I met with the Union of Manitoba Municipalities and it has all kinds of things that need to be done and that money could be spent on.

The government is fond of saying that people could not run a household like it runs the government. That may be true but the fact is that it often misrepresents how it is running the government.

When we add up our monthly finances we do not lump our 25-year mortgage into what we owe for the month of January because we make distinctions between money that is borrowed for long-term purposes and will come back to us in the form of assets and future benefits and money that is just spent for immediate purposes. One of the distinctions this government seems unable to make is the difference between those two kinds of moneys. It is a distinction that the municipalities in particular have been able to make.

I think all provincial governments are in a bind, not just the ones governed by New Democrats. The fact is that the provincial governments do find themselves in a situation that is quite different from the federal government because the provincial governments do not control fiscal and monetary policy. The provincial governments do not theoretically control the Bank of Canada. The provincial governments do not have the ability to initiate new tax measures as the federal government does. If they do initiate some new tax measures often the effects of these are vitiated by the fact that a neighbouring

province tries to take advantage of the fact that they have initiated a certain tax measure.

• (1920)

Their hands are tied in many respects in a way that the federal government's hands are not. That is why it is so absolutely crucial that we get some leadership from the federal government. In the meantime provinces can be different one from another in how they deal with the off–loading and what they decide to do with that fact, what they choose to cut and how they choose to cut it. I think provincial governments will have to come to be judged not by the fact that they were forced to cut back but how they went about it and what they cut back.

Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (Okanagan—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for my colleague, the member for Winnipeg Transcona.

With respect to the whole situation of level of taxation we often hear the concern, and it is a legitimate concern, that Canadians are overtaxed. When we look at the level of taxation in Canada as compared to the two dozen or so nations in the OECD we find that Canada is right about in the middle. Over all we do not pay excessive taxation. It is when you look at how much taxes individuals pay compared to the corporate sector where you find the discrepancy. Individual Canadian taxpayers pay a very heavy amount whereas corporate Canada pays very little in comparison when you look at the percentage breakdown.

Going back to the 1950s corporations and individual taxpayers shared about an equal amount in terms of the over–all tax revenues collected, about 50–50. Ever since then the level of income tax that individuals have to pay has gone from about 50 per cent almost up to 90 per cent whereas the level of taxes that the corporations pay has gone down steadily from that level of 50 per cent to approximately 10 per cent.

The discrepancy is very large and has been one that has been magnified or exacerbated by the policies of this government.

I wonder if the member for Winnipeg Strathcona would like to comment on this very real discrepancy we see in the level of taxation.

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, I think the member makes a good point that the relationship between corporate and personal income taxes in this country is way out of whack. At one point, as I think he mentioned, it was somewhat in the neighbourhood of 50–50, 50 per cent corporate, 50 per cent from personal income tax. Now personal income tax makes up far and away the largest share of that kind of tax and the corporations are down to around 10 per cent or 15 per cent and it gets lower all the time. Again this is a trend that had its beginnings with Liberal budgets in the 1970s. It is a trend that has not stopped.

It is a trend that this government has not been willing to put a stop to either in terms of corporate tax rip–offs or tax breaks and also in terms of the breaks that have been given to the very wealthy in this country as a result of a deliberate self–conscious policy on the part of the government.

The present Minister for International Trade, formerly the Minister of Finance, said in his first budget the problem with Canada is that we do not have enough rich people. He has succeeded in making some people rich but he has done that by making a heck of a lot of other people a lot poorer than they were and he has done that by changing the income tax system so that the people in the top percentage pay a whole lot less than they would have had we kept the system that was in place when they came to power.

As far as Canadians being overtaxed, obviously certain Canadians are being overtaxed in relation to other Canadians. The middle class in this country, those who play by the rules and pay the bills in this country, are the ones who are being taxed to death. They are the ones who cannot afford the accountants and the lawyers to figure out how not to pay taxes. They are the ones who basically this government and this country depend on in order to finance the workings of Canada. They are the ones who are overtaxed. But even they have to keep in mind, and I think we all have to keep in mind, that when we compare ourselves to some other countries, particularly to our neighbours to the south, that when we figure out our tax burden here we are also figuring into it the cost of our health care.

• (1925)

I know that many Canadians will go across the border and they will notice that the taxes on liquor are next to nothing and the taxes on this or that are next to nothing and they say: "Wow, terrific. Why can't we have a tax system like the Americans?" What they do not realize is

that the average family of four in the United States pays somewhere in the neighbourhood of $300 or more per month for health care insurance. That is for health care coverage that does not compare to what we get through our taxes. Of course that does not even take into account the 35 million Americans who do not have any coverage at all.

You have got to do this kind of mega accounting or macro accounting when you talk about tax burdens. Canadians have coming to them a social wage in the form of medicare and other things that they pay for through their taxes that many of these other countries, particularly the United States which is said to have a lower tax burden, simply do not have.

Hon. Roy MacLaren (Etobicoke North): Mr. Speaker, the budget tabled in March was the final budget of this government. As such it served as an appropriate epilogue to nine years of Conservative rule. It was similar in intent to the December 1992 financial statement, that is it was not directed primarily at Parliament or even the Canadian people generally but rather at foreign lenders.

The main purpose of the budget of March, as in the previous financial statement last December, was to reassure those increasingly jittery foreign lenders that the government has Canada's fiscal well-being firmly in hand. That of course would be no easy task.

Since this government took office in 1984 the national debt has almost tripled. The debt and deficits of the provinces have ballooned almost beyond recognition and the Minister of Finance has been consistently unsuccessful in meeting his own relatively modest deficit targets year after year.

Even less easy has been the government's task of convincing Canadians that it has finally achieved the kind of fiscal sanity for which it was elected or for which it claims to have been elected in 1984. Suddenly, if belatedly, the public at large has become seized with the magnitude of Canada's debt problem. It will be a major if not the major issue in the forthcoming federal election with party leaders as well as provincial premiers vying with each other to assure the Canadian people that they know best how to tame the debt and the deficit. Instead of competing in spending promises as was the case in past decades, instead of promising the Canadian people more and more, the leaders of tomorrow will be competing in reduction promises.

The government's credibility problem is rooted in the fact that it is once again relying on exceptionally sanguine economic forecasts to mask a debt and deficit problem which it appears again powerless to resolve.

As outlined in the recent budget the government is basically assuming that Canadian output will rapidly build momentum during 1993 underpinned by solid export gains and further interest rate reductions.

• (1930)

During this period it is suggested that sustained economic growth of nearly 4.5 per cent will coincide with inflation at about 1.5 per cent. That would be a truly remarkable performance, not just in relation to our major economic partners, but in relation to Canada's more pedestrian record over the last decade.

Short-term interest rates will remain around 5 per cent, a mere 70 basis points above the U.S. levels. Long-term government bond yields will drop to 6 per cent and stay there. A combination of export led growth, low real interest rates and continuing low inflation will allegedly be sufficient to move the deficit below its $35 billion high water mark.

Never has the government's perennial tendency to use optimistic assumptions to generate longer term fiscal dividends been more evident than in its 1994-98 projections. A more cautious and realistic forecast would yield much less favourable fiscal results.

For example, the deficit could be stuck around $30 billion in a world of 3 per cent growth with modestly higher interest rates. Without revenue increases arising out of significant growth and low inflationary pressures, the proposed freeze on inflation adjusted spending will likely prove inadequate to address the government's serious fiscal imbalance. A multi-year freeze on actual program spending is needed to ensure that the official deficit forecast is realized.

The weakness of the government's approach to the debt and deficit problem over the last nine years is really twofold. First, in seeking to balance its escalating budgets, the government essentially opted for what it believed was the politically more expedient route of tax increases rather than spending reductions.

Since 1984, Canadian taxpayers have been subjected to no less than 38 separate tax increases, including the GST, amounting to almost $1,900 per household. Having once enjoyed, along with such countries as the United States and Japan,, one of the lowest per caput tax rates of OECD members, Canadians now have the dubious distinction of being among the most overtaxed people in the industrialized world.

The government's repeated boast that excepting interest payments on the debt, as if you could leave that aside, it has finally achieved an operating surplus is technically true. But it is one which has been bought at the expense of a crushing tax burden on Canadians. In an era when international competitiveness depends so much upon raising the levels of domestic savings and investment, the central thrust of the Conservative economic policy has been to tax increasingly the earnings of Canadians rather than promoting investment.

We have in these past years reached the point where tax-based solutions are no longer a realistic policy option both economically and politically for any future Canadian government. As the deputy minister of finance said only yesterday, if personal income taxes are raised much higher, the government risks driving Canadians "offshore or out of the formal economy".

Although it is true that the government has refrained from new tax increases over the past year, largely because it has left itself without any real choice in this matter, total tax revenues will stay close to 18 per cent of our gross domestic product for the foreseeable future. That is nearly two percentage points above the levels prevailing during the economic boom of the mid-1980s.

• (1935)

Moreover, provinces such as Ontario, British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Newfoundland have taken advantage of the lull to boost aggressively their own tax demands.

In following this path of least resistance the government did not counter inflation at its root, the stated objective of its economic policy. Rather, it fuelled it by its own excessive spending and by its all too frequent tax increases.

It was left to the Bank of Canada to attempt to combat inflation with the single tool, or I should say sledge-hammer available to it: high interest rates. This in turn helped to place Canada in a vicious circle of higher debt service charges as interest rates went up, higher deficits, higher taxes, higher inflationary pressures and deeper recession.

Perhaps the most worrisome effect of this vicious circle that the government created for itself is the rapid escalation in Canada's foreign indebtedness which now stands at over $200 billion.

As Canada's foreign borrowing has ballooned, Canada's deficit on current transactions with the rest of the world exports, imports, cross-border flows of investment has grown to 4.2 per cent of our gross domestic product. This is a level which is unsustainably high.

To illustrate this point let me underline that from 1985 to 1992 net payments of interest and dividends on our foreign debt increased by 74 per cent compared to a 43 per cent increase in our nominal gross domestic product. It is obvious that sort of increase in our foreign indebtedness cannot continue indefinitely.

There is of course nothing right or wrong a priori with foreign borrowing. What matters is why we borrow and what we do with the money we borrow. For instance, we may want to borrow because we see profitable investment opportunities that can procure for us a return in excess of the interest to be paid on the borrowed money. In such a case, incurring a current account deficit is then simply sound economics.

That is precisely what frequently happened in Canada in the 19th and early 20th centuries. Arguably it also underpinned investment booms and natural resources in the 1950s and 1970s and to a lesser extent, the public investment boom of the 1960s.

Despite relatively high levels of debt during those periods Canada's economy still performed well when it came to job creation and growth. Largely that was because the debt was amassed for productive investment in building highways, mines and pipelines. We and the foreigners recognized the extraordinary investment opportunities of the times in physical and human capital. Foreign borrowing was probably the best decision to make in those circumstances.

Foreign deficits can also reflect shortages of domestic savings that send the country borrowing abroad even if domestic investment is not so buoyant by past standards. Borrowing then serves to maintain consumption at high

levels relative to our own income. As the saying goes, we are then in danger of living beyond our means.

It seems probable that the current account deficit explosion of 1985 to 1992 is in the latter category. Unlike investment booms of the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s the spurt of domestic investment of the last five years was much less intense. Two-thirds of it was in housing as opposed to productive plants, equipment and structures.

Most important, over-all domestic investment has experienced a long-term decline. The late 1980s investment peak is about the same magnitude as the early 1970s investment trough. National savings are even more depressed. At 15 per cent of gross national product in 1992 they stood at the lowest point since the Great Depression.

• (1940)

Part of the problem is with the recession induced collapse of corporate and government saving. Even the 1989 savings peak at 20 per cent of our gross national product was at a historically low level comparing unfavourably with the 24 per cent average rate of saving of the early 1970s. The savings decline like the investment decline is a long-term not a short-term phenomenon.

It should be noted that all of this also carries a significant financial market risk as well. Lower interest rates are part of the official solution to the deficit problem. If federal and provincial governments show no sign of decreasing their demand for offshore borrowing, unfortunately international investors already sensitized to exchange rate risks because of last year's extraordinary turbulence in currency markets, are likely to view the absence of meaningful fiscal improvements as adding to concerns over the credit quality of domestic securities. This raises the risk premium on such investments and limits the potential for durable interest rate relief.

The second weakness of the government's approach to Canada's debt problem is really the first writ large. If the government has found it politically difficult to reduce spending over the last nine years, it is largely because it has failed to develop a comprehensive plan for restructuring and redefining the way in which government operates in this country.

After all, this issue concerns more than some abstract figures termed "the national debt". It is about the size, the role and the efficiency of government, a sector which, as many competitive experts all too easily overlook, now accounts for no less than 50 per cent of Canada's gross domestic product. It is about the allocation of resources in a way which promotes productive investment and physical and human capital rather than the kind of spiralling consumption we have witnessed in Canada over the last decade.

Instead of devising ways in which government might work better and smarter, to borrow from the Clinton lexicon, the Conservatives chose to leave the old structures and programs in place while attempting to cut and trim around the edges. The fact that the deficit remains stuck at $35 billion after nine years of such trimming underscores the real limits to this approach.

The first priority in tackling the debt crisis should have been to attempt to engineer a national solution to what is manifestly a national problem. Without real and binding co-ordination between Ottawa and the provinces, there was simply too much scope for unproductive shifting of spending among governments or for wasteful duplication of activities and conflicting policies.

The Conservative government offered up instead a unilateral reduction in provincial transfer payments, accompanied by pious admonitions that the provinces should follow Ottawa's lead in getting their fiscal houses in order. Faced by a sudden shortfall in revenues the provinces predictably reacted by ratcheting up their own deficits and occupying any tax room vacated by the federal government.

Another obvious target for reform was the bewildering and overlapping web of individual transfers and tax exemptions which has passed for a comprehensive social safety net for the last three decades. Even those aspects of our social security system that are more targeted have tended to evolve as *ad hoc* political and social expedients. It has been an accumulation over time of responses to special demands and not a co-ordinated approach to human resource development.

The present system of tax deductions and exemptions, for example, has often proven to be a less than successful means of targeting social assistance, if only because benefits tend to rise with the increase in income, often turning such provisions into tax shelters and loopholes.

Nor was the existing collection of selected transfers designed with considerations of efficiency in mind. On the one hand most social welfare programs incorporate few incentives to work. On the other hand they deny income support to one group in society particularly deserving of help but largely overlooked by the present system: the working poor.

• (1945)

Increasingly, Canada is funnelling scarce resources into a social security system which is not just obsolescent, but to a degree unsustainable. The point here is that we need to restructure fundamentally the way in which social services are delivered, possibly along the lines of a negative income tax.

The government's economic fiscal and monetary policies of the past years have left Canada in a situation that is increasingly difficult. With interest rates higher than economic growth rates and the Canadian economy recovering, even while overseas economies remain in a slump, it seems unlikely that the normal growth rates and cycles in the economy will solve this problem.

The challenge will be there for the next Government of Canada.

Mr. John Manley (Ottawa South): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for his address this evening. Tonight's ultimate votes go to the centre of parliamentary democracy. This is when we vote on supply for the government.

I have been doing a little study of the supply that was granted by Parliament over the votes of the opposition in a previous fiscal year. In fact I recently received some information by way of the Order Paper which I would like to give to my colleague. He may have some comment on it.

In April 1992 I asked what the cost was of the public opinion polls that had been commissioned by the government opposite for the year 1991–92 and what the purpose was of those polls. The government spent over $5 million on frivolous public opinion polling.

I would just like my colleague to be aware of what some of the ridiculous expenditures were from a government that goes around the country spewing forth propaganda about fiscal responsibility and how it wants to take care of the taxpayers' money.

The government spent, for example, $140,000 evaluating a special income assistance program by way of public opinion poll through Agriculture Canada. It spent $200,000 checking out the attitudes and perceptions of farmers concerning federal agricultural policies and issues facing the industry by way of public opinion poll.

It conducted a poll to find out whether or not people in Atlantic Canada know about the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency. It had money for that in these tough, tough times.

Let us see what else we have in here. Immigration Canada spent $452,427 trying to find out what Canadians thought about various immigration issues.

I suggest to the government that it might want to consider having the odd election more frequently. It would soon find out what Canadians thought about it and its policies.

Out of Energy, Mines and Resources the government spent $15,000. What for? To test new R–2000 logos. That is just a little bit below the minimum wage for a year for some people living in Canada.

This is the kind of thing this government, which is seeking our support for its spending estimates, has found time to do. I have only gone through a few pages of a very long report.

I know there are other questions and comments so I would like to give my colleague from Etobicoke North the opportunity to comment on the fiscal prudence of public opinion polling on an enormous scale by the government opposite.

Mr. MacLaren: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member draws our attention to a significant problem in the way in which this government has engaged in profligate spending during its eight or nine years in office. The example he has cited is only one of many that could be pointed to with regard to the excessive use by government of outside consultants, and in this case public opinion pollsters.

• (1950)

The instances he has brought to us this evening raise two fundamental questions. One is the desirability of any government engaging in such widespread and basically irresponsible public polling and having followed that extravagant route, not sharing with the taxpayer the results of its polling which the taxpayer has paid for.

The basic problem is whether this sort of extravagance can be justified in any way. Quite clearly it is one of the instances that the Auditor General should examine. Such instances should be a matter for concern on the part of all taxpayers as we consider the ways we govern ourselves.

I can hardly believe there are any Canadians who would think their taxes should be spent in the way the hon. member from Ottawa has just described. I welcome his taking the occasion this evening to draw our attention to this sort of irresponsible extravagance that has marked the whole term of office of the present government.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Nic Leblanc (Longueuil): Mr. Speaker, I listened earlier to the hon. member for Etobicoke North who made a nice speech on what the government did wrong which lead to the current deficit and government inefficiency. I want to point out to my Liberal colleague that his own party was in charge of managing the affairs of the nation for many years, from 1972 to 1984, and that during this period the Liberal government spent more than it could afford to. Today we know very well the main cause of this situation. It is the centralizing Liberal government which generated those terrible deficits by creating a climate of confrontation between the provinces and the federal government.

The Conservative government made the same mistake. Last year, for the first time in the history of Canada, a department of education was set up, in spite of the fact that education is a provincial matter. Duplication of management activities between the provinces and the federal costs over $10 billion a year.

The Liberal member who wants us to believe that there are ways of improving the administration of this system while at the same time maintaining a climate of confrontation between the federal government and the provinces would only perpetuate what the Conservatives do and what the Liberal government did before.

I wonder if the hon. member will ever learn that the only way to succeed, to steer Canada away from bankruptcy, assuming it is not already too late, is to decentralize. Only then will we be able to reduce expenditures and make all these operations more efficient. What do the hon. member and the Liberal Party propose to improve the economic situation of the country?

[*English*]

Mr. MacLaren: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether my friend who has just asked me the question wishes to engage in a pot calling the kettle black type of conversation. He was a Conservative for some years and presumably in that role endorsed the extravagant spending practices of the present government.

• (1955)

I think it is idle to spend a lot of time addressing the question of what one government or another did in some years past. What we are debating tonight is the government's supply measures. We are addressing the practices of this government over recent years.

If the member wishes to speak of centralization or decentralization I think that he is posing the problem in the wrong terms. Surely he or any Canadian taxpayer would want to see the elimination of duplication and interprovincial barriers to the free movement within our own country of goods, services, people and capital. I do not think it is beyond the wit of the government of the day or indeed of parliamentarians to eradicate the myriad of ways in which we engage in extravagant duplication between two and indeed three levels of government. If we seriously addressed the question of interprovincial trade barriers we would make real progress in the reduction of excessive government spending.

Mr. Pat Sobeski (Cambridge): Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the questions were long because the member for Etobicoke North talks about the past and I wanted to ask him a question. I will put it on the record and I am sure he will respond.

For every $3 in spending cuts in Bill Clinton's budget there is an increase of $1 in tax, while the budget of the last finance minister gave no tax increase and then cut

spending. I was curious to see how the member for Etobicoke North would have responded to that.

I really admire the member for Ottawa South but I cannot go back to 1984 because neither he nor I were here to talk about past records. He brought forward some numbers and I am sure if I were to go back to the 1968 to 1984 period I would easily find similar examples of probably even greater extravagance.

Between 1979 and 1984 government spending by the Liberals increased by 13.8 per cent. We were also into high inflationary times and the inflation rate was 8.6 per cent, so during that period the Liberals managed to spend at a rate of over 5 per cent of the rate of inflation.

Meanwhile between 1984 and 1992 there were controls on spending by this government. During that period the inflation rate averaged 4.4 per cent and yet program spending increased by only 3.7 per cent or less than the rate of inflation. All the provincial budgets increased their spending by 7.2 per cent against an inflation rate average of 4.4 per cent, so their spending was 3 per cent above the rate of inflation. Everything has to be measured against a norm and the rate of inflation is a good way to do it.

Since coming to office this government has taken solid action to reduce government spending because the time has come for governments to start living within their means. Major house cleaning was required and this government had the courage to do it.

The government has turned a large operating deficit—and that is the difference between revenues and spending on programs of the early eighties—into a substantive operating surplus. What does that mean? In 1984 the government was bringing in $71 billion in revenue but it was spending $87 billion on program spending. Then it had to pay $22 billion on the interest so we were running a $16 billion deficit just on services. Imagine bringing in $71 and spending $87. A household cannot exist like that but the Liberal government had the capacity then to borrow and so it borrowed the $16, paid $22 interest and then we ended up with a $38 billion deficit.

• (2000)

Today government revenues are $120 billion. Leadership candidates of this party are saying if we cannot live with $120 billion we can reallocate and get our priorities right. They are saying that is enough for a government to exist on. But our program spending is only $115 billion, so now we are running a surplus. Members are quite correct that the total debt has increased and the carrying charge on the interest is some $40 billion today. That results in the $34 or $35 billion deficit that we have heard talked about today.

How do we try to compare those types of numbers? The period of 1969–70 is significant in Canadian history because it was the last time the federal government balanced its budget. As a percentage of gross domestic product 14.7 per cent was spent by the government on program spending. By 1984–85 it had risen to 19.5 per cent of GDP. Of course GDP is like family income because it is the income of the nation. Spending rose by almost 5 per cent but the government revenues did not so the result was an imbalance.

This government has taken spending from 5 per cent better than the rate of inflation to almost 1 per cent below the rate of inflation and now in 1991–92 program spending represents only 16.7 per cent of GDP. With that trend we are getting back to the stage as in the late fifties and sixties when governments got their spending down to 14 per cent of GDP. That is the direction this country has to move in and we are moving in that direction.

There have been spending controls. The member opposite for Ottawa South was a member with me on the finance committee when we were putting through a piece of legislation on spending controls. The hon. member and I in the finance committee travelled to Washington to review the Gramm–Rudman recommendations to control the American budget. There was the belief in Canada that the Americans were tremendously successful in containing their deficit. We went down and talked to the people in Congress and their support staff and clearly the Gramm–Rudman report was a failure.

It was a failure for two reasons. They tried to establish a target on spending and I think the projections were low on spending. They also projected targets for revenue and I think they were optimistic. The Americans wanted to

reduce their deficit to zero with that difference and they had to keep moving the targets. It just did not work because again they over-estimated revenue and under-estimated their expenses.

We came back from the U.S. with the recommendations because I have learned to listen. Occasionally members opposite do have good suggestions and the member for Ottawa South recognized it was a good suggestion. He gave some advice that the Tories on the committee accepted, just as I am sure the Minister of the Environment is listening carefully to backbenchers like myself as he projects to keep spending within the $120 billion envelope he has promised. We will see that transform over the next five years. I know I will be here for that.

• (2005)

An hon. member: Over the next four years.

Mr. Sobeski: Over the term of the government. I know the member for Ottawa South will be in Ottawa. Whether he will be sitting in the House remains to be seen.

We put a control on spending, a 3 per cent cap. We had good debate and we came up with a piece of legislation. When the current finance minister was looking at the budget to put controls on spending—and the member opposite might correct me if I am wrong—I believe our inflation rate was hovering around the 3 per cent to 4 per cent rate.

Inflation is now down to 1.5 per cent from 2 per cent. Therefore it was logical for the finance minister to say: "If inflation is down to 1.5 per cent, let's bring down the spending control caps to 1.5 per cent or 1.7 per cent". That simple action of cutting spending over five years by 1.3 per cent was accompanied by good fiscal management, prudence and a finance minister who said no when backbenchers or members opposite came forward and said to spend money. When the finance minister says no it represents a future savings of $7.5 billion which then carries forward each year into other budgets. I think that is significant.

For the benefit of most people out there, the Spending Control Act is not the sacrificial lamb. It is not the $15,000 study that the member for Ottawa South pointed out. There are sacrificial lambs people would like to see cut but the real savings are built upon policies like the Spending Control Act.

We have also reduced programs in the area of defence spending. There were reductions in the December economic statement and the April 1993 budget that alone total $5.9 billion over five years. This is in addition to the cuts made in successive budgets since 1989. The cumulative effect of the cuts from 1989 to 1997 will be about $14 billion. What it means for DND is that it has to start establishing priorities, putting its priorities in order. The government feels it is enough money to do the job. It just has to establish its priorities.

The funding for the green plan originally was $3 billion over five years. Again because programs have to be reduced and all departments have to share their portion of the burden, it has now been spread over six years instead of five.

We have had changes to the unemployment insurance where the average benefit was frozen in the 1992 economic statement and in the 1993 budget. That will save employees and employers contributing to the UI fund some $4.5 billion over the next five years. There have also been changes to permit eligibility. This is the voluntary quitters program that has been referred to. Again that will save over five years $2.7 billion from the premiums employees and employers have to pay into the unemployment insurance fund.

We have also seen cuts to grants and contributions. For example, grants to businesses and special interest groups were mentioned in the 1993 budget. Grants to most organizations and interest groups will be cut by 10 per cent in 1993 and 1994. They will be cut by a further 15 per cent in 1995 and by 20 per cent a year thereafter. Business and interest groups and individuals have also seen their grants cut up by $75 million in the past year and $125 million this year.

• (2010)

The hon. member for Mount Royal asks whether it gives one great pleasure to do this. No, it does not. There is no great pleasure in going to the taxpayers of Ottawa South and asking if they want $125 million in taxes to be used to pay for programs the member for Mount Royal wants. It is painful to do that. That is all taxes are; it is moving it from one taxpayer's pocket over to another taxpayer's pocket. The allocation that takes place is the difficult part.

I admire the member for Mount Royal for her consistency. When I say there were cuts to cultural subsidies she is well aware of them. Research Council grants have been cut. I give her credit; she is always pointing out to the government the importance of these sectors. I admire her for her consistency and I appreciate it. Certainly I witnessed it during the NAFTA debate when we saw many changes to the Copyright Act and the Patents Act. She made a tremendous contribution. The people in the cultural industry and probably even the bureaucrats in the federal department appreciate it. I digress.

We have also seen programs eliminated. The petroleum incentive program of 1986–1987 resulted in savings of $1 billion a year. We have seen cost recovery measures. Governments provide services and it was deemed that if a service were provided to somebody or a licence issued then there should be a fee for recovery. We are seeing the fees for visitor visas and other immigration services increased. This will bring an extra $100 million into the Treasury each year. It is just paying for the cost of providing the service.

We are seeing better management of Canada student loans. Because of the high default rate the government is now collecting money from delinquent student loans, which is recovering over $40 million a year from the $1 billion that students owe.

We are seeing management improvements with, for example, the direct deposit of Public Service pay and pension cheques. Although very small it represents a savings of almost $1 million a year just by doing something simple like direct deposit.

We have seen profit making Crown corporations being asked to return more to their shareholder, the government. In 1990–1991, for example, we saw $150 million returned.

We have seen the inflation allowances for departmental capital and operating budgets being limited. This will result in savings of $1 billion between now and 1994–1995.

We have seen privatizations. We have seen the shares of Air Canada being sold to the public. That brought $707 million to the Treasury. We have seen the sale of 30 per cent of Petro–Canada, Teleglobe Canada, Canada Air, de Havilland, CNCP Telecommunications and CN Hotels. The list goes on.

We have seen the budget for CMHC social housing frozen. We have seen CBC frozen. We have seen VIA Rail subsidies reduced. We have seen caps on transfers to the provinces. Yet in the last budget the finance minister did not reduce the transfers to provinces.

I have tried to demonstrate quickly in the limited time available what the government has done. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for listening very patiently during my 20–minute presentation.

• (2015)

Mr. John Manley (Ottawa South): Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to my friend from Cambridge. He was quite right in saying that we worked together on the finance committee when we reviewed the spending control legislation.

He failed to mention that the unanimous report that the finance committee prepared on that was in large part rejected by the government. It was not followed. We, members from all parties, made recommendations that would have tightened the Spending Control Act but they were ignored.

I would like to take him back to the answer that I received from the government a while ago on my Order Paper question concerning the fiscal year 1991–92. I asked: "What was the total cost of all public opinion polls conducted or commissioned by any department? What was the purpose of each?"

The member made one reference to the fact that I was talking about amounts of $15,000. Indeed I did refer to one for $15,000 to test the R–2000 logo. I do not know about the member for Cambridge but my parents always taught me that if we look after the pennies the dollars will look after themselves.

I have a stack of paper that I received from the Government of Canada about public opinion polling and I am disgusted by it. I want to ask the member why we have to go through nine years of Tory government awash in rhetoric about cutting the deficit when this kind of thing is still going on in 1991–92.

Let me give a few further examples. The Minister of External Affairs spent $159,751 for two public opinion surveys. This is a 1991 update on Canadian public opinion on foreign policy and international relations.

Then there is the Minister of Finance. This one is nice and succinct. He is the one who goes around preaching to us about the deficit. He spent $226,800. Why? The survey was to assess public awareness on fiscal and

economic issues and economic attitudes and opinions before and after the budget. That is from the Minister of Finance who was talking to us about tightening our belts.

What did the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and the Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, the former Minister of Finance, spend? He spent $204,985 in that year. He wanted an environmental omnibus survey on fish and seafood consumption. This is a report including one customs survey, a survey of public opinion with regard to seals and sealing, cost and income surveys of fishermen and data surveys of commercial fishing licences on both coasts.

I have more. They just keep going and going. I am sure the member for Cambridge is anxious to get on his feet and distance himself from a government that would waste taxpayers' money, the hard-earned money of people in his constituency and mine, on frivolous pursuits like these.

Mr. Sobeski: Mr. Speaker, I will make three points.

One of the things we learned during this Parliament was the desire of Canadians to be consulted. When we have a country that has 27 million people and is 4,000 miles long a government cannot be criticized for consulting.

As usual the hon. member brings out a long list. That last one works out to one-third of one cent per Canadian to study the attitudes with regard to the fisheries business and get information on it. If the hon. member is suggesting that Canadians do not want to spend less than one cent per Canadian to improve the fishing industry I do not know where he is coming from.

My final point is that he has a report before him. I was wondering whether there was an appendix attached which would explain the cost to the taxpayers of his request to dig up all this frivolous information.

Mr. Brian L. Gardiner (Prince George—Bulkley Valley): Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a brief comment and ask a question of the member about a very important program that this government is now endangering.

• (2020)

I am referring to the Forest Resources Development Agreements with the provinces. The April 26 budget of the Minister of Finance said that this government is now shelving those agreements between the federal government and the provinces, which have done wonders in terms of reforestation, silvicultural work and research into forest concerns, and it is also doing so in the mining sector and in a number of other areas.

I have two brief comments with regard to the Forest Resources Development Agreements. My information on this does not come from any of the letters I have written. It comes from the government's estimates. The budget of the Minister of Finance talks about how it intends to do away with these agreements because they are generally in areas of provincial jurisdiction.

Yet I would like to refer the member to the estimates for Forestry Canada for 1992-93. It says the very opposite on page 54, that most of these agreements have now been funded in areas of exclusive federal jurisdiction, in research, wood lots and other areas. It is particularly disappointing to the people in constituencies across the country and those resource dependent communities, over 300 of them are dependent on the forest industry alone, that the message from this government is that it does not care about forestry.

Does the member think that this decision by the government, which is in the estimates, is a prelude to eliminating the Department of Forestry?

Mr. Sobeski: Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer that question. The hon. member knows that in the Charlottetown accord a part referred to the six sisters. It talked about returning housing and forestry to provincial jurisdiction. However I cannot speak with any knowledge as to what would happen.

The member raises a very valid point. I do not dispute the numbers that he has put on the record at all because he did carefully read from the budget. I found it interesting that after the budget the finance minister was criticized because he did not cut deep enough.

After the budget there are always a number of receptions that take place. I went to one where I was greeted by a group of businessmen, eight or nine strong, who stood as a group and criticized the government. They asked: "Why did you not cut deeper?" When I broke away from that group and stood by myself someone from the mining industry came over to me. The

mining ERDA grants were cut the same as forestry. I am not sure to what extent but they were both cut back.

Mr. Gardiner: When they expire.

Mr. Sobeski: When they expire, as the hon. member says. I was now one on one with this individual from the mining industry. He was part of the group that was condemning this government for not cutting deep enough but when it was one on one he asked: "Why are you picking on my industry?" That is the difficulty the finance minister has. We have to take a look at a wide range of programs and establish our priority. In this case, the mining sector and the forestry sector were cut back.

There are always cutbacks. One of my favourite groups was the Economic Council of Canada which suffered the same fate in a previous budget. These are worthwhile organizations. There are grants that are very effective for industries but when it comes time to cut back the cuts do hurt. That is the best that I can respond to the member's question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): We switched speakers because the hon. member for Etobicoke North had an engagement that he had to attend. The hon. member for Cambridge allowed him his time. Therefore the hon. member for Cambridge was next and now we must get back to the routine again. Therefore I will go to the hon. member for Hochelaga—Maisonneuve and then I will go to the hon. member for Mount Royal on debate. The hon. member for Hochelaga—Maisonneuve.

• (2025)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Allan Koury (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to participate in this debate on the estimates.

Based on this year's budget, total expenditures should rise by only 1.5 per cent, a tiny increase, which goes to show how much attention is paid to the two major challenges facing the people of Canada and their government. More than ever, considering the size of our debt and the ever increasing debt service charges we have to pay, the people of Canada are expecting their government to keep spending under control.

It was with that in mind that the Spending Control Act received royal assent in 1992. This Act provides for expenditure ceilings which will ensure that between 1991–92 and 1995–96, program expenditures will not exceed the levels projected in the 1991 budget, except in specific circumstances. It also allows these ceilings to be adjusted downwards yearly. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the expenditure plans contained in this these estimates are well under those required by law.

During that five-year period in an all-out effort to reduce the deficit by $30 billion, $7.5 billion in savings are planned just in government spending.

To achieve this while at the same time providing Canadians with the services they have the right to expect, the government will continue to streamline its operations to reduce its operating costs while improving its efficiency. That is why certain functions have been eliminated and certain service points closed. For instance, External Affairs will be closing down nine missions, including three embassies, while the number of immigration centres will be brought down from 64 to 51, 22 of which will be relocated with Canada Employment Centers.

With the operating budget system in place throughout the federal Public Service since April 1, 1993 managers are now invested with greater decision-making authority. With budgets covering wages, operating expenditures and minor capital expenditures, managers can chose the most efficient combination of resources to achieve their program objectives and meet the needs of their clients.

As indicated in the budget, there will be a $300 billion cut in operating budgets as well as reserves for contingencies and new initiatives in 1993–94 and further cuts in 1994–95 to reach $1.2 billion in 1997–98. Together with the wage strategy and the budget cuts instituted in the December 1992 statement this should allow for total savings of $1 billion in 1993–94, growing to $2.1 billion by 1997–98, which means that over the course of this five-year financial framework savings will amount to over $7.5 billion.

Needless to say, because of these drastic cuts in operating budgets the Public Service needs more than ever to adapt, to innovate and to improve its efficiency.

• (2030)

It can be said today that the Public Service is at the forefront of new technologies in the field of information, for example as regards EDI, the electronic data interchange, as well as secondary technologies such as bar codes. EDI is already being used for collecting GST and source deductions, for electronic filing of GST and taxpayers returns, as well as to replace documents at point of entry. Moreover, as early as June 30, thanks to the Fast track initiative of Supply and Services Canada, suppliers will be electronically linked to federal departments and agencies which will help cut costs for the public sector and its suppliers, as well as improve the competitiveness of our business sector on world markets.

We are also innovating on other fronts, including the provision of services. For example, the Public Service has set up as a pilot project three service centres for Canadian businesses where business people can readily get accurate information on services and programs provided by the main federal departments and agencies. This is the case with the Edmonton service centre where, among other things, one can inquire about Supply and Services' tender process. In addition to representing 14 federal departments and organizations, as well as some provincial and municipal services, the Winnipeg centre also represents several business groups, industries and university groups. The fact that all these public organizations get together to provide in a single location the services required by their clients is the logical and desirable result of the implementation of the single window concept.

The single window concept, which was first mentioned in the 1992 budget, has become the InfoCentre initiative of the Government of Canada. An infocentre allows several departments to provide, in one location, information, publications, forms, interviews, etc., to clients who are not necessarily business people. For example, you can go to an infocentre to have a lost government cheque replaced. The Cornwall InfoCentre maintains the infosource index which provides all the available information on programs offered by federal departments and agencies. Under the authority of Employment and Immigration, 129 infocentres already provide services on behalf of eight departments, including the Department of National Revenue, Veterans Affairs, Health and Welfare, and the Treasury Board Secretariat.

The special operating agencies, a concept which dates back to 1989, also illustrate the efforts of the government to manage its operations like the private sector. These 12 agencies, soon to be 16, are operational services which, while remaining within their respective departments, operate more according to the standards of the private sector. Many Canadians have already noticed an improvement in the service provided by the Passport Office, which was one of the first special operating agencies.

In view of such changes, public servants have had to show great adaptability. I would recall here that they, like all other Canadians, are participating in the deficit reduction effort, but that they are brilliantly meeting the many challenges they face. Thus, for the first time since the Institute of Public Administration of Canada and Coopers and Lybrand have awarded the Innovative Management Prize, the federal Public Service was among the finalists. The Department of Fisheries and Oceans, as well as Supply and Services, were chosen for their innovative ideas and were among the five finalists.

• (2035)

To make the contribution of public servants better known and to thank them, the government passed a bill which received royal assent on June 4, 1992 and instituted National Public Service Week, which will take place from June 13 to 19 this year. To highlight this event the government will give its annual awards of excellence and its annual prizes for employment equity. It will also be an opportunity for the departments to organize activities like awards ceremonies, conferences on better management practices, exhibits in shopping centres and visits to schools. More than ever, it is important to show that the Public Service can be proud of its employees.

I will close with these few words: the main estimates before the House are real evidence of how seriously the government takes its financial management. Everything is being done to reduce the cost of running the federal government and thus to reduce our deficit; also, everything is being done to give Canadians the services they

demand in the most innovative, creative and economical way.

Mr. Nic Leblanc (Longueuil): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Hochelaga—Maisonneuve has spent a good part of his speech explaining that the government has undertaken with its officials a process which has led him to believe that the government is actually going to reduce its spending. He referred to government spending for previous years and for years to come.

I would like to point out to him that with respect to spending restraint, if he refers to page 21 of the 1993 budget tabled on April 26, it says the exact opposite: spending is expected to increase by about $3.6 billion next year, $3.1 billion the following year and so on for a total increase of $12.5 billion over the next five years. That is quite substantial, a $12 billion increase over five years. The hon. member would want us to believe that the government is cutting back when in fact its spending is increasing. All he has to do is read his finance minister's budget speech. It is very clear.

When he talks about deficit reduction, what he is really talking about is an increase in revenue because government revenue will indeed increase from $122 billion to $163 billion relative to spending. I would like the hon. member to check what his finance minister said in his statement to begin with. I for one believe the Minister of Finance, but apparently the hon. member does not because he is not even referring to the 1993 budget speech. I would like the hon. member for Hochelaga—Maisonneuve to tell me at the same time how he plans to achieve this deficit reduction. He knows full well as a member from the province of Quebec that one of the best ways of reducing the deficit is to start by avoiding duplication.

• (2040)

We know there have been detailed studies on the subject. The cost of duplication is between $2.5 and $3 billion a year, just because of administrative overlaps between the federal government and the province of Quebec. Managers in the Quebec Finance Ministry do the same as their counterparts in the Department of Finance in Ottawa. The same applies to managing economic development and manpower, with managers doing the same thing at the federal and provincial levels. It costs between $2.5 and $3 billion a year, just in administration costs. And let us not forget how inefficient all that is. So, my first question is this: does the hon. member believe what he is saying or what the finance minister from his own party has put in writing in his budget?

Mr. Koury: Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Longueuil says that we did not cut expenditures. If you look carefully, you will see that you are including previous deficits. I think you are mistaken when you say that. You will notice that cuts were made in practically all departments. You should try and see that. Do not look only at the documents.

I think you selected certain figures. I can tell you that Quebec receives about $4 billion more than it sends to the federal government. So do not tell me that you are getting short-changed.

As far as duplication is concerned, it is normal to have a federal finance minister because he oversees what is done in every provincial finance department across Canada. There are also other departments that are very important if we want to be more efficient. Look also at some of the provincial departments and you will see that there is no duplication there. I think those departments are important.

Mr. John Manley (Ottawa-South): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member from Hochelaga would agree with me that the real waste in Quebec is all the money spent by the Bloc Quebecois to seek political independance for Quebecers, when those same Quebecers are really seeking jobs. That is what I call waste.

I would like to ask a question of the hon. member from Hochelaga about the Conservative record of fiscal management. He made a speech on public finances and, as I said earlier, I requested some pretty complete and complex information about this government's management and I received a lot of data.

I asked for specific information on the cost of opinion polls ordered by various departments. I will give the member some examples on which he may want to comment. The Minister of State responsible for Fitness and Amateur Sport requested a survey on the Task Force on Federal Sports Policy. Two contracts were awarded for a total of $75,000, although the actual amount paid was a bit less than that. Two other contracts were signed. The first one at $34,430 was for a telephone survey and the other one at $14,000 was for a survey of young athletes.

• (2045)

The list goes on. Polls were made for Forestry. Another one made for Indian Affairs cost $150,974, and so on. Earlier, the hon. member for Cambridge said that these expenditures were not important, because they are not very substantial. For my constituents and maybe those in Hochelaga, those amounts are not so insignificant. They are in fact quite extraordinary since the Minister of Finance keeps saying that we have to cut the deficit.

I would like to hear what the hon. member has to say about that.

Mr. Koury: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to answer my colleague's question. I believe in consultation across Canada. People told us that we did business without consulting them; well, now we do business after having consulted them. I think that is quite important. It costs less to consult that way than to go door to door and to have groups travel from one end of the country to the other.

It is quite important to ensure that people make their views known. The only way is to spend a few cents and not dollars as you say. It adds up to dollars, but if you take the total picture, instead of spending millions and hundreds of millions of dollars for crossing the country by plane to consult one and all, it is much better to consult as we are now doing; it costs less and the people are consulted. I sincerely believe that it is an appropriate and important way to do so.

[*English*]

Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal): Mr. Speaker, I rise to take a look on behalf of my constituents in Mount Royal from the towns of Côte St. Luc, Hampstead, Mount Royal and the areas of Snowdon and Côte des Neiges to kind of examine with their eyes the estimates that the government has tabled, the vote on the supply to government and what it implies for them.

I certainly would like to share with the people of this House and the population at large some concerns I have about the cultural sector because it is an important industry. It has important revenue potential. I think that its vitality whether at the federal level, the provincial level or the municipal level has a growth potential that is vital to Canada regardless of language and regardless of where one lives in this country.

If we look at what the Tory finance minister has done and what the Tory thinking has been, we have seen them follow the same destructive path over the past eight and a half years. The trickle down economic philosophy that allows for market forces only without some sense of responsibility for government to enable the direction of the market forces has been pretty apparent. If one looks at the fact that we have focused on fighting this supposed deficit which was created by the poor management for the most part of this government one wonders about the manner in which this government has chosen to address the needs of a society that is in a serious state of recession, some of it brought on by this government's policies.

It should rebuild this country, help people have a sense of hope, help people face the future with a sense that someone cares and someone is listening out there.

[*Translation*]

The surveys to which my colleague referred, the hon. member for Hochelaga—Maisonneuve said cost only a few cents. For me, $5 million is not a few cents, it is an impressive amount.

• (2050)

[*English*]

Therefore I would say that protecting our society, maintaining our culture and respecting the Canadian historical development are all key and important matters.

Estimates define the financial format, the financial face, the thinking of a government. If you look at what this government has done, it has once again spawned a budget that desperately tries to achieve zero inflation and zero deficit. In actual fact the gap is far more serious and is far from zero. It lacks any kind of respect for Canadians and how they are facing everyday life for the

most part. The rich get richer and it quickly impoverishes most people in our society.

We have had to face, as I have said, the worst recession since the thirties. We are drowning in a national debt that is now upward of $490 billion.

From the time of Confederation to 1984 our total debt was under $200 billion. From 1984 until now, nine years, it has more than doubled. It is over $450 billion. Who did it? This government that does not even know how to manage. It has managed to more than double the national debt since it came to power.

When I hear about these great Tory managers who have not been able to do anything other than double the debt, and certainly have not managed to reduce the deficit, I would ask, along with the 38 tax increases, how come all my constituents, and I am sure all theirs too, want to know where all those tax moneys are going.

We have become the most overtaxed nation in the industrial world. That is what it states in the OECD. It is not me speaking. I did not look at those figures. I am telling you what the figures say and what the international world is saying. These numbers are real. They have hard, concrete impact on Canadians and on Canadian families and to many people who are struggling in my riding.

I want to know when this government will stop its stubborn pursuit of zero inflation and start to care about the unemployed people trying so desperately to find work in an economy that has been ravaged by enormous lay-offs in the private and public sector and non-stop bankruptcies in the small and medium sized business sector.

The budget is deadly silent on the whole question of job creation. There are no training programs that have been implemented for workers, no transition mechanisms from old jobs to new and no training for the 1.5 million unemployed in our country let alone addressing those 2.6 million Canadians who are on welfare. It is a disgrace for thousands of Canadians who have to join them every week.

Unemployment in my riding is staggering and particularly in the visible minority sector and among young people, people who are fighting discrimination every day, trying to enter a work force that still shrinks every day because of this recession.

What is there in this budget to give them hope except a wait and see and, as I said, trickle down philosophy? I would suggest that in the line-ups at the food bank, which we should be closing not opening and enlarging, not many of those tummies are going to be filled with the kinds of policies we have seen from across this floor. Not too many new homes are going to be built. The waiting list for social housing gets longer all the time. Those who are suffering from a disability are also finding it very difficult.

If this is how we are going to build the program of prosperity I would hate to think of what is really going to take place because it is really a program of austerity. For the millions of unemployed, studies have estimated that there could be a savings to the government. For every one million people who are employed we would save $25 million. Therefore, if this government is really serious I would suggest that it sit down, figure out some kind of a vision for the future and put people back to work so that they can get off welfare and unemployment insurance and demonstrate through their will to work that they can make this economy grow. That is how to make this economy grow and how to make the wheel turn.

This Conservative government came to power buttressed by a single message: less government.

You do not have to write him his questions. Believe me he has been in this long enough he can write his own questions. Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, I could not help but note the sort of crib note that is being written over there.

• (2055)

Little did Canadians know that less government meant less for themselves. Due to the inaction of the Tories the indelible impression that is imprinted on the minds of Canadians is that government is not working for them. I can say nothing is truer than that.

The government has no comprehensive plan that aims to encourage investment in research and development, no long-term strategy designed to create jobs, no blueprint which proposes to revive the economy in an equal way.

The Liberal Party has some very good plans and I suggest that they could be very helpful in putting people back to work. We shared them with this government. We have offered all kinds of help to this government but this government is not willing to put Canadian people back to work and that is a shame.

Rather than concentrate on the measures that would help improve the economy from infrastructure through youth programs these Tories have cut funding to social housing. They have cut out so many things it is a disgrace.

As a matter of fact while waiting for my turn to speak this evening I was looking through a book called *How Ottawa Spends*, published in the interest of a more democratic Canada. The edition comes out every year. This is the 1993–94 copy. These are not my facts and figures; they come from there. They are quoted also by *The Toronto Star*. They point out that the Tory government has used the policy of stealth to siphon billions of dollars from the country's social programs with minimal political costs. For that I would say they are rather shrewd: how to write pretty packages but do not look to the contents because they are weak or empty.

The program spending has been constrained, frozen, or reduced in social housing, legal aid, unemployment insurance, health care, social insurance, and post–secondary education among other areas. This is what these authors have said. They say the Mulroney Conservatives have fundamentally changed some foundations of modern social policy in Canada, terminating the family allowance program, abolishing the universality of the Old Age Security plan and ending federal contributions to the unemployment insurance scheme. I am quoting from Michael Print, James Rice and Ken Battle.

The result has been damaging to the social safety net and weakening to the bonds of nationhood. I think we are going to pay very seriously for these very short–sighted measures.

Somewhere by the way amidst this muddle of tax controls and empty promises we have lost track of the cultural and social institutions that have come to identify us as Canadians. What else would really identify us as Canadians over time?

I would like to see what the government has done in its spending estimates and in particular those relating to the ministry of communications and culture.

I do not want to repeat myself *ad nauseam* but maybe it might get through the thinking of this government when I say that culture is the way we live wherever we live, it is whatever language we speak, it is how we eat, it is how we dress, it is how we go to work, it is how we play, it is how the games are involved, as well as it is the visual arts, the plastic arts, the music, the dance, the songs, it is pop culture, modern culture, as well as the traditions that have come in. It certainly includes an expression of multiculturalism, the diversity that is this country. In the French language and in French Quebec there is diversity as there is in *francophonie* across Canada, the same way there is in English, anglophone, and allophones.

The very essence of our national identity and the bedrock of our national sovereignty and pride is the way this expression is made. It gives meaning to the lives of every Canadian. It enriches the country socially, politically and economically.

I would suggest that the increased globalization and advanced technologies that are tearing down national borders, creating what Canadian economist Marshal McLuhan aptly called the global village, has become a reality.

The industries that manufacture the messages and imagery that creates the national and international cultural atmosphere has grown greatly in size and breadth and productivity capability over the last 50 years. New technology, satellites, semi–conductors, microchips, fibre optics, digitization are driving these industries at a dizzying pace.

This is industry, like agriculture is industry, like fishing is industry. Cultural matter is industry. It is big bucks. It is big money and it could be a big earner in Canada if we would get our act together and figure the whole thing out. It is also what helps to identify us in the world.

• (2100)

They are expanding cultural industries, they are merging, transnationalizing and becoming a significant component of the global economy. They have had a more powerful impact on our children and grandchildren than either World War I or World War II.

We deposited a study today on the implications of violence on television that demonstrates the pervasiveness of this medium and the importance it has in our lives and the variety of issues that can be addressed through this medium.

To meet these challenges we need more than ever national commitment to cultural development. Without a commitment the Canada we know and love and are so proud of will not survive.

Past Liberal governments put a lot of policies into place which the government then went about systematically cutting. We put in Canadian content regulations for radio that are known to have fostered the domestic pop music industry.

Bill C-58 provided a tax break for business advertising in Canada so that we developed a magazine industry. They were instrumental through tax incentives, Canadian content regulations, the creation of the National Film Board and Telefilm Canada. We have encouraged through these mechanisms growth of the Canadian film and television industry.

We have created the Canada Council which has been desperately crying for more money which they fundamentally need if we want to build a base and grow in our artistic endeavours. They have been the key to nurturing creative talent in the performing and visual arts.

As a result of these far-sighted initiatives, film makers, writers, artists, designers, architects, musicians and performers today are winning international acclaim. Yet what have we done?

After 35 years of sustained achievement in the arts and winning all kinds of awards in every field of artistic endeavour, the majority of our artists have had to survive on a shoe-string. The Conservatives come in here and cut, cut, cut. They are drastic cuts. They have been the deepest in indirect subsidy cuts which were in place for most of the eighties through such programs as the capital cost allowance in film and the postal subsidies in publishing.

For example, the GST and postal subsidies cutbacks have taken away some $200 million in the past year, a far larger figure than the $19 million publishing program announced by the Minister of Communications last year. When the loss of such programs were factored in, the cuts from 1984 to last year amounted to 24 per cent while defence spending rose 38 per cent.

A year ago our standing committee talked to and expressed our real alarm at the evidence that Canadian investment in these cultural industries had been diminishing in real terms. We called for a halt to that trend. We recognized the potential for growth and identity and waving the Canadian flag with a sense of pride. We said: "Increase it 5 per cent per year".

What have we done? The April budget continues to cut and extend all the cuts for an additional three years to 1997-98. Program cuts of 10 per cent to grants and contributions for 1993-94 and 1994-95 will remain as announced in the December economic statement.

However the cuts will be further increased to 15 per cent and 20 per cent for every year thereafter. This will result in a total cut of $246 million over the next five years. I think that is disgraceful.

The budget also hits the CBC, cutting $50 million from its budget in 1994-95 and $100 million a year for each year thereafter. Obviously they do not like public broadcasting.

It is also interesting to note that the government is making cuts to cultural spending at 10 per cent over the next two years as compared with an operating cut of 3 per cent for government expenditures. A great example. The Canadian Conference of the Arts points out that the government imposes a standard of restraint upon the cultural sector that it is not even willing to impose on itself.

I was very distressed to learn recently that the government is continuing to ravage Radio-Canada International, RCI, which is our international voice to Europe, South America, the Middle East and Japan. It reaches about 10 million listeners, including Canadians overseas. It is a Canadian voice to our people overseas. It is the link. It is the promotional tool. It is the economic and social values that are being cut.

• (2105)

RCI which used to be controlled through the Department of External Affairs, which at least selected its languages, has now been transferred. In 1990 its funding was taken over by External in the amount of $13 million. It was declared to fall under grants and contributions. Therefore the RCI budget will be cut by 10 per cent in 1993-94 and 1995. It will be cut 15 per cent by 1995-96 and 20 per cent for every year after that. With an annual budget of less than $13 million these cuts are going to be the death of Radio-Canada International.

We are smaller than Holland. We are smaller than Finland. For goodness sake, do we not have any sense of pride in reaching the people, such as Canadians who are

working overseas and our soldiers who are out there around this world? No.

The heartless, cold-blooded member has no care whatsoever about this. We merged Canada Council and SSHRC. We cut Canada Council which is so important to the lifeblood, the growth and development of a pool of talent for Canadians.

By the way, the cost which was not supposed to be very much to move, renegotiate the lease, change the computer system and negotiate the labour contracts is in excess of $9.2 million, more than $500,000 annually for this great saving by putting SSHRC and Canada Council together. It was a marriage they did not want. They had undertaken a divorce and now the Tories are forcing this remarriage. Thank goodness the Senate put in an amendment that might make some sense. It might force this government to review a very stupid undertaking.

I will conclude. I have lots more I could say but, Mr. Speaker, you have told me that this is the end of the line. It is the end of the line for many of us with this government. It is the end of the line hopefully as far as the people of Canada are concerned. We can wave bye-bye like Madam Denis did to the Prime Minister as he tried to cut old age security: "Bye-bye, Charlie Brown", "Bye-bye *mès amis*". That is the end of this government hopefully and not soon enough.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Charles A. Langlois (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and to Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I will be brief, because there are a few other members with questions for the hon. member for Mount Royal as well.

First of all, I would like to say to the hon. member for Mount Royal that the electoral district of Manicouagan, on the north shore of the St. Lawrence, east of Baie-Comeau, extends as far as Blanc-Sablon and includes the towns of Fermont, Schefferville and the Inuit villages on Ungava Bay. In Manicouagan, we have people who work in iron ore mines, forestry and fisheries. These are all people who work day in, day out to earn a living and pay considerable amounts in taxes to the Government of Quebec and the federal government. Perhaps the hon. member for Mount Royal should know more about a riding like mine where people work very hard to pay taxes and support the federal government's programs.

I would like to get back to a remark by the hon. member for Mount Royal that between 1867 and 1984, the federal deficit was $200 billion. I would like to ask her, and I will have another question as well, what the cumulative deficit was in 1980 and what it was in 1984, when her party lost the election and we Conservatives took over. I will give her a chance to answer this question in a minute.

I would also like to point out that when the Conservatives came to power in 1984 the federal government had an operating deficit of $16 billion, which means that the Liberals were borrowing $16 billion every year to pay the groceries. I may point out that in 1989-90 the federal government's operating deficit, the difference between total revenues from taxes, customs duties and taxes on corporate profits, and government expenditures, which was $16 billion in the fall of 1984, at the end of the 1984-85 fiscal year had been replaced by an operating surplus of about $10 billion in 1989-90. So, between 1984-1985 and 1989-1990, our government has turned around the government current account from a $16 billion deficit to an operating surplus of over $10 billion in 1989-1990. The surplus even reached $14 billion and I can tell you that at the end of the 1992-1993 fiscal year, even in times of recession, the government current account still shows a $9 billion surplus, which means that since 1989-1990 our operating budget has been in the black not in the red as it was under the Liberals in 1984-1985 when we were swept into power.

• (2110)

I will conclude by putting a second question to the hon. member for Mount Royal. She should remember that in 1976, 1977 or 1978, some time maybe before she came here, but surely at least at the time that she came here, the political party she belongs to and which then formed the government put in place a price, profit and expense control policy to try to contain the then galloping inflation. In the end it did not work. I would like to ask

her to tell us what kind of policy her government put in place at that time to control inflation. She and her colleagues complain about our interest rate policy, aimed at lowering inflation, but what did her government do in 1979 to try to fight inflation and control its increase?

Mrs. Finestone: Mr. Speaker, I will answer. Do not worry. I took note of the remarks and I can assure him I will answer in due course.

First of all, I know the member for Manicouagan. You came to the committee on culture and you came to mess things up regarding Bill C-62. I remember pretty well where you are coming from, where your interests are, and I will never forget what you did either.

But regarding Manicouagan, I can tell you that I have toured this area and that I know it fairly well. I have a niece who has been working as a school teacher in Blanc-Sablon for the last four years. It is beautiful where you come from. I went fishing there and I enjoyed the locals. I know a few of the Cree who live there as well as their chief and a few women.

Regarding your questions on inflation and what we did beween 1976 and 1978, I can tell you that we created jobs. You know, jobs, jobs, jobs. It is us, the Liberals, who created the jobs. Not only did we create jobs, but go and ask ordinary Canadians if they had a better life in the sixties and the seventies than now. Did they keep more money in their pocket than they do know?

I must tell you that they felt much better then, even during the recession in 1981 and 1982 when we went through a world-wide recession, whereas the one we are in now is the direct result of the government's policies and that makes all the difference in the world.

[*English*]

Ms. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East): I would like to congratulate the member on her very passionate speech on a very important subject. I would like to ask her, since I have a special interest as she knows in multiculturalism, to relate a little bit about multiculturalism and Canadian culture generally.

We know that part of our culture and our ethics in Canada is to respect diversity. But it seems to me that regardless of which ethnic group or which language group or which region of Canada we come from, we still must have some kind of common bond which is Canada, which is greater than the sum of all of us. It is very hard to describe what that is.

I wondered if she would like to make a stab at saying whether or not Canada has a distinct culture and what this might consist of. Also what can we be doing to more effectively promote a distinct Canadian culture?

• (2115)

Mrs. Finestone: Mr. Speaker, I visited the riding of the hon. member for Vancouver East and had a very good time in that area. We had some fun together. Her question is one that would take time to examine because it has many parts to it.

With the development of a proper distribution and marketing responsibility held in the hands of Canadians, we could improve the visibility and the star-making potential the Americans are so good at.

One must recognize that our screens, whether it is theatre, television or video, have less than 5 per cent of any Canadian content yet we have more talent per square inch in Canada than almost any other country in the world.

I guess by our regional nature we have in the making—and I would put it that way—we are in the making of an extraordinary cultural expression indigenous to ourselves. It is not old enough yet to have passed all the tests of time.

It is certainly there in the field of creative writers as we win prizes all around the world, in French and English. Certainly we win in the field of song and in the field of dance. Of course we have on the French side some extraordinary creative works which have gained world prominence.

It is hard to say that it is strictly Canadian but it is an amalgam of the region in which one lives. Canada is a regionalized country as well. Whether one is of a visible minority or white but with a diversified background, which is found in all shades of the spectrum, there is an approach that expresses a sense of sensitivity, tenderness and care that is particular to Canada. It differs from the rest of the world.

One hears it expressed in song, in music and in writing. Our great expanse of geography and territory, the grand north, the cold weather, all those factors play into it. Now I am getting into a whole philosophical trend and I do not want to do that right now.

Mr. Jesse Flis (Parkdale—High Park): Mr. Speaker, just before coming to the Chamber I had a call from Patrick Lyons of the alumni at Woodsworth College, University of Toronto. He was calling the alumni to raise funds because he said that this had been the lowest funding the University of Toronto had had in 10 years.

I wanted to ask the hon. member whether the Quebec post-secondary institutions are faced with the same critical problem of the federal government reducing transfer payments to post-secondary institutions. What implications will this have on our future as Canadians?

Mrs. Finestone: Mr. Speaker, with the cuts in transfer payments right across the land, of course there has been cutting in the post-secondary educational field. It has impacted right across this country.

The implications are in a globalized world of economic development and growth where technology, excellence and value added are the keys. If we do not develop the intellectual capacity of our students at this point so that we can became increasingly more competitive, we are doing and rendering a disservice unto ourselves. That is what this government has done. It has rendered Canadians a disservice in this manner.

Mr. John Manley (Ottawa South): Mr. Speaker, my colleague has been expressing concern about cuts. She no doubt will want to look for areas in which cuts can be made and I have some suggestions for the Department of Communications that perhaps she would agree with.

Does the hon. member think that this government that talks about deficit reduction was wise to spend $30,000 on public opinion research in the Department of Communications? This was to check key indicators estimating the economic impact of copyright violation.

There were public opinion surveys on programs such as an audience reaction to the film *Nurses*, a study of pre-recorded video cassettes in health and social services sectors in Quebec, a study of the use and purchase of pre-recorded video cassettes in the francophone educational market of Ontario. Is this a good way to spend our scarce cultural and communications dollars?

• (2120)

Mrs. Finestone: No, not at all. I thank my hon. colleague for all the information he was able to bring about this supposedly competent, careful, caring government and the fact that for $5 million we did not get anything of much value at all.

Mr. Darryl L. Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine): Mr. Speaker, it is soon to be nine years that I have had the honour and privilege of representing my constituents in the House of Commons. And I am still astonished to listen to the Official Opposition.

With all due respect—because we do all respect in this great Chamber—I am astonished to listen to the hon. lady speak about government cuts and government debt when $200 billion was spent by the Liberal Party up to 1984 having assumed government with zero national debt.

The hon. member has the audacity to speak about the mean Tories trying to get the debt under control. I understand how my constituents feel when they listen to debate in the House of Commons. One side stands up and the other side contradicts it. They mislead the people with the mention of cuts in culture and communication.

The national debt we inherited in 1984 was $200 billion. Had we not had to pay just the accumulated interest, today we would have an extra $40 billion to $50 billion to help all those interest groups and departments of which the hon. member has spoken.

The hon. member said it was $200 billion and that we have doubled it. If I recall correctly in 1984 the Liberal Party left an annual deficit which was very close to $40 billion. We have tried just to continue to pay the interest on the waste of the previous government. If my calculations are correct, and they quite often are, speaking as a small *c* Conservative, had the Liberals remained in power our national debt today with their programs and policies would be in excess of $700 billion. That is a very conservative estimate.

When talking about government expenditures, the hon. member has mentioned that the Liberal policy prior to 1984 was jobs. They did create jobs in my constituency. It was called the national picnic table project. You worked for 10 weeks either building picnic tables or

cutting bushes. The young men and women who worked on the projects received no job training, only to get their 10 weeks in stamps, no job formation. To keep in line with the times, $200 billion was squandered with nothing in return but a make work project.

We have dealt very efficiently in trying to cut our expenditures since 1984. As my hon. colleague from Manicouagan has stated, we have cut government expenditures and government operations and turned them into a surplus.

Canadians realized in 1984 that votes could no longer be purchased by wasting money. Votes could not be purchased by making false promises. Fiscal restraint had to be brought into order. That is what we began in 1984 and we continue today.

With the main estimates for 1993–94 and with the budget of the Minister of Finance we attempted to meet two goals, two important challenges for Canadians: the challenge of restraint and the challenge of reform.

• (2125)

After the 1984 election it was very difficult when the Progressive Conservative government said it must impose some types of restraints. It was very difficult and very unpopular. The former manufacturing tax was hidden and no one knew what they were paying so we introduced the goods and services tax. It was very unpopular but very open.

We listened today to the Official Opposition with great interest on this side of the House with regard to what its tax policy is. At one point its hon. leader said it would scrap the GST. Next time around the hon. Leader of the Liberal Party said the Liberals would study it for two years. Then there was another statement that said perhaps that tax should be hidden.

They were thrown out in 1984 partly because the tax was hidden and Canadians wanted to see what they were paying up front. The final part of the party platform is that it will go to an all–party committee. The Liberals have formed the government for most of our over 126 years of existence and they have never listened to anyone but themselves. What would ever make Canadians believe they would listen to anyone except their own group?

We have continued in the ways of restraint, a very difficult problem and very difficult for all Canadians. During the past eight years this government has sold or dissolved 20 Crown corporations and has wound up, merged or consolidated another 40 government organizations. This is a remarkable record and one we are continually striving to improve upon. Nonetheless this government is not content to dwell on its past successes. Rather we are thinking about the future.

In 1992 this House approved the Spending Control Act, legislation significantly limiting program spending for the next five years. Be assured the spending plans outlined in these main estimates are well within the limits prescribed by that act. In fact the Minister of Finance has announced that the limits within the act will be trimmed even further in order to bring them into line with the reductions set out in our recent budget.

Canadians have said time and again that we must cut our spending and that they want more bang for the buck. We have been doing that. We have responded with a total of $30 billion in spending cuts within the last budget and a reduction in the cost of government by $1.2 billion by 1997–98. This is in response to what Canadians have told us must be done. These are difficult steps to take and as I stated earlier many times unpopular. We must demand that taxpayers get value for their dollars.

To continue on with the spending estimates, the Prime Minister initiated Public Service 2000. I would imagine that on many occasions the Public Service is not always in love with the politicians and perhaps vice versa. Public servants are doing their part. They realize that they too are on the payroll of all Canadians. They are being asked at the same time as everyone else to produce more with fewer dollars. They are implementing new ideas and making limited dollars work harder for the benefit of all Canadians.

The government is also working toward removing the obstacles that block Canadians from dealing easily with the Public Service.

[*Translation*]

In French, we have the term *guichet unique*.

[*English*]

The single window concept will allow several services to be attained at the same place. This is a very innovative idea with much less cost to Canadians who need both services and information with regard to the federal government. Canada's public servants are working harder to establish a more client–centred environment in order to serve all Canadians. Our government is dedi-

cated to making a Canadian system work and making our system work with limited resources.

We have mortgaged our grandchildren and children to come. This cannot be continued. It must be known, and all Canadians widely accept it, that we must do more with fewer tax dollars.

• (2130)

In her closing remarks the hon. member talked about cuts in several departments. Choices must be made. Choices will have to be made by all Canadians and by governments as to what can be afforded, what we can pay and what we cannot pay. I believe strongly that all Canadians wish to participate in government operations. All Canadians wish to contribute in their own way, be it physical, intellectual or monetary. All Canadians must be required to contribute to the betterment of the well-being of our society.

It is indisputably clear to every member of this House that this government has had the courage of its convictions and has established an unswerving course toward fiscal responsibility. We are a government that will live within its means and in this way provide a secure future for all Canadians.

The budget reductions found in the main estimates before us today are only one of many steps toward a more prosperous tomorrow and the removal of the burden of the national debt from the backs of those to follow us.

We have had a passion for reform and many times have been criticized for not going far enough. It is very difficult to make drastic cuts without influencing some sector of our society.

In the early eighties there was a horrible recession. In the late seventies I was building a house and the interest rate on my mortgage was 22.75 per cent. The excuse by the government of the day at the time was that it was a hard recession and we needed the high interest rates. Like all Canadians, I paid the price. We borrowed from Central Mortgage and Housing at 22.75 per cent.

We have just come through a very difficult, very long and very hard recession. For those Canadians who follow Canadian government and Progressive Conservative policy we have had two years of a difficult world-wide recession and our interest rates today are about 6 per cent. As a non-partisan member of this House, there has to be something right there. The previous recession was not judged to be as severe as the recession we have just come through. Yet interest rates then were 22.75 per cent and now they are 6 per cent. Our policy must have something going for it.

A Canadian family paying a $500 mortgage with interest rates 10, 12, or 14 points below what they were under the Liberals when we were coming out of a mild recession is saving in excess of $50 per month. I should take the opportunity to congratulate the President of the Treasury Board and our Minister of Finance for our sound fiscal policy.

It becomes difficult when we debate in the House of Commons, as Canadians listen, who is going to do what. Our party has the fiscal policy, the fiscal will and the political will. We have shown it in the past and we will continue to do so in the future. No, program parties and false promises will not fly with Canadians in the next election campaign.

Canadians have put the challenge to us, the government, and we have risen to the occasion. With the estimates tabled here today our government will truly be providing more for less. Moreover, we will be steadfast in our commitment to control spending, eliminate waste and contain the cost of government.

These main estimates are a reaffirmation of this government's long established tradition of responsible stewardship of Canada's finances. As we continue toward the year 2000 we have laid the basis and we will continue to do the groundwork for a better, safer and richer Canada.

Mr. Brian L. Gardiner (Prince George—Bulkley Valley): Mr. Speaker, I will be brief. I appreciated listening to the hon. member's comments. I have a question for him about the estimates for Forestry Canada, which I have in my hand. I served on the forestry committee with my colleague and I know he is concerned about the future of our forests in Canada.

• (2135)

The estimates outline some of the highlights of Forestry Canada for all different parts of the country including British Columbia and Quebec. The forest agreements have helped a considerable amount in my province and in the member's province. I would like to ask the member, knowing his concern about this particular issue, the concerns he might have about the government's

announcement that when these agreements expire they will not be renewed.

I know the member has some concerns about the resource communities that are dependent on forestry and mining. I wonder if he could give us some indication in what direction we might be going in this regard. I have a sense, maybe misplaced, that what we might be looking at in this Parliament before the next election is a change in the cabinet line-up and in particular the Minister of Forestry or maybe doing away with that department. I wonder if the member has any particular insights into that and also some of his concerns perhaps about the expiry and eventual doing away with the forest agreements.

Mr. Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine): Mr. Speaker, my colleague asks about the forestry programs we have in place, particularly in British Columbia and the province of Quebec. One of the difficulties, as has been stated at first ministers' conferences, is the duplication of programs.

One of the suggestions made and I think widely accepted is to eliminate duplication in jurisdictional powers among the ministries. In the long run it would be better to have a division of these powers so that the provinces know what they are doing, what they are responsible for, and the federal government knows what it is doing. We do not need two bureaucracies.

As my hon. colleague knows, and I can speak with more authority coming from the province of Quebec, the Minister of Forestry in the province of Quebec, the hon. Mr. Albert Côté, has asked for some time now to have exclusive provincial power over forestry. This is one solution, but the solution is not 100 per cent fair because we have to go through the transition period.

I would tell my colleague it is difficult with the cutting in the different departments. The only way we can arrive at a solution is to increase taxes and cut government spending. People are taxed enough. We can only cut so much. The forestry area has been asked to absorb the 10 per cent cuts like other departments.

It becomes difficult but I believe that by working with the provinces, the federal government and the forestry sector in our own provinces we will arrive at a solution. Again as I mentioned earlier in my speech we must learn to do more with less dollars.

Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River): Mr. Speaker, I listened to the hon. member and I heard him say that his government was committed to living within its means. I am sure I heard that.

I know that the hon. member this evening will rise in his place and vote in favour of estimates and a government financial program that involves a deficit of some $38 billion. That is not living within one's means. I would have to admit that the government and Parliament have failed to live within their means for a whole lot of years.

Having said that, I want to point this out to the member and ask for his comments. One of the major functions of this place, of this Parliament, is to approve and appropriate every single dollar that is spent by government. We authorize the tax and the expenditure. That procedure is called estimates.

• (2140)

Every year the estimates are brought into the House and placed with committees that are supposed to review the estimates and make comment. If I am not mistaken, not one committee of this House has completed its function in reviewing the estimates in this critical year and not one committee has reported back to the House on the estimates in this critical year.

I will premise my question to the hon. member by saying that this party has made some reform proposals to help this place do its job better in dealing with estimates. I am asking him what he has done, what he will do as a backbencher in that party, what his government has done or what it will do to reform this place and permit Parliament through its work appropriating and authorizing government expenditures?

Mr. Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine): Mr. Speaker, to go back to my earlier remarks, I mentioned that we passed the Spending Control Act, one of the acts passed to control government spending.

With regard to my hon. friend's comments about the individual committees and the estimates, it is a well known fact with the committee reform brought in by this government that committees have much more power than they had in the past.

I am not in a position to speak on behalf of all committees but there is a window that is open for all committees to study estimates. At the same time all committees have an opportunity to invite and look at any types of legislation they so desire.

With the votes coming tonight in the House of Commons, my hon. friend should realize that in all committees there are three official parties and if any one member for any party including the government side, but usually it happens in opposition, uses delaying tactics in the committee then of course we run out of time.

I not sure if that answer is sufficient to my hon. colleague but of course when we get into the vast amount of expenditures it is very difficult to get down $4.80 or $480 as his hon. colleague spoke about this afternoon. It is very difficult when you start questioning every expenditure.

I would assume it was the good will of the government that brought in committee reform and government reform. As we get ready to sit and form the next government we will again become more and more independent and give all members of the House more authority in questioning how we spend Canadian tax dollars.

Mr. Jesse Flis (Parkdale—High Park): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member was present in 1983 until the Prime Minister was elected leader of the Conservative Party. The leader then predicted he could reduce the deficit to about $3 billion by the year 1990. In fact, by the year 1990 the deficit was 10 times that to the tune of $30.5 billion.

He was in caucus. He supports the leader. What happened? Why did he not insist in caucus that his leader live up to the promise made during the leadership race?

Mr. Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine): Mr. Speaker, I was indeed at the convention in 1983 and the good Lord willing I will be in 1993. I guess it would not be fair to say who I am supporting but we know that the province of Quebec has been known to produce some great statesmen.

When we took the reins of power, we might be excused in saying the books were not the same. We have introduced more measures of restraint than the former Liberal government did since Confederation.

My hon. friend mentions $3 billion. We cut government spending. We stopped frivolous spending. We moved into job creation and job training, something that was never done before. We went through a world-wide recession with a $30.5 billion deficit while they went through boom years with a $40 billion deficit.

• (2145)

We went through the worst recession known since the 1930s and came out with a 6 per cent interest rate. They went through a mild recession with an interest rate of 22.75 per cent. That is good sound fiscal policy.

Mr. Ian Waddell (Port Moody—Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I will be Charestable, I mean charitable and ask him a short question.

In 1975, the time of the last balanced budget in Canada, the deficit was $55.8 billion. In 1993 the present deficit is $458 billion. Would the member tell the House the names of the two political parties that were in power in the years between 1975 and 1993?

Mr. Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine): Mr. Speaker, one of the parties was not the New Democratic Party. It had one opportunity in Ontario and we see what it has done in three short years. Thank God for that.

As I explained earlier with the $200 billion deficit, the accumulated debt we received in 1984 and the accumulated interest on it, we have brought the annual deficit down to $30 billion. If the Liberals had stayed in power we would now owe today in excess of $700 billion.

We are down in government operations and spending to a surplus of $9.7 billion which is something that was never seen until the Grits got hold of a zero deficit and squandered $200 billion. Another 10 years of Tory government sound fiscal policy and everything will be under control.

Hon. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton—Melville): Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words in this debate today. We have a bit of time before 10 o'clock p.m. for my friend from Okanagan—Shuswap if that is okay with the Chair.

I believe the debt and deficit problems in this country are now getting very serious. Let us look at some of the basic facts. In 1975 which is only 18 years ago the national debt was some $55.8 billion and the annual interest

payments on that debt were $3.9 billion. Eighteen years later after nine years of Conservative government and nine years of Liberal government the national debt had gone from $55.8 billion up to $458 billion. That is $458 billion in 18 short years. Our interest payment now on that debt per year is no longer $3.9 million but is $39.5 billion. It is 10 times as high as it was some 18 years ago.

This debt is being run up for two or three major reasons by Liberal and Conservative governments. It is being run up because for many years we have not had a proper jobs policy where we put all our energies and imaginations to work to create long-term jobs for the Canadian people. The best way to pay down a debt is to have jobs for the people of this country.

Second, in the last four or five years, particularly between 1988 and 1991, we have had a high interest rate policy in this country. The bank rate has been much higher than it should have been, particularly for short-term interest rates in Canada. As a result we are now paying billions and billions more in interest on our national debt. Our national debt is much higher because of high interest rate policies.

At times the bank rate in this country was 5 per cent higher than the bank rate of the United States. When that happened the economy slowed down which created more unemployment. We had higher interest payments on the national debt, municipal and provincial debts and personal and business debts right across this country.

For those two reasons in particular we have seen in this country a national debt that is now much higher than it should be. We have a national debt that is the second-worst of the G-7 countries and almost the worst in the OECD. That is the legacy of the Conservative government across the way. That is the legacy it has left us after nine long lean years in power.

Another reason why we have a large debt in this country is that we have had a tax system that is very unfair. Wealthy people have been getting many tax breaks for family trusts. Large corporations have many different loopholes. There is exemption for capital gains outside of the family farm, the residence and small business. There have been exemptions for entertainment. There have been many, many exemptions. On the revenue side we are collecting less money than we should because of tax breaks for wealthy people.

• (2150)

At the same time there have been hand-outs for the wealthy. In the last budget, tabled only a month or so ago, there was some $3.3 billion in subsidies for business and much of that was for large business. Over the years we have seen many, many hand-outs by the government to their large business friends such as the Reichmanns, Olympia & York, the Campeau Corporation and many other corporations. They built their ivory towers, their huge buildings and many of them were very unproductive. Now they are in massive debt as well. But many of these things were built because of hand-outs and really corporate welfare for the rich. For those reasons we have a very serious problem now with our national debt.

Why address the problem? First of all, this debt costs us a lot of money in terms of workers. We did some calculations the other day and found, for example, that the average Canadian worker with a spouse and two children, earning the average wage in this country, ends up costing the Canadian government a lot more money if he or she is unemployed. The average worker will cost the federal government some $2,200 in forgone income tax, $730 in reduced federal sales taxes, $730 in forgone pension and unemployment insurance contributions, $6,700 in unemployment insurance benefits claimed, and some $2,300 in the federal share for new welfare claims. That is the average cost of one worker being unemployed to the federal government in this country, a worker who made the average salary with a spouse and two dependants.

For the provincial governments this is what that average will cost: $1,150 in forgone income tax, $850 in reduced provincial sales taxes and $2,800 in the provincial share for new welfare claims.

If you add that up, Mr. Speaker, the total cost for the average unemployed worker in this country for the federal and provincial governments in a year is $17,500. That person is not paying the income tax he or she would be paying, that person is not paying the sales tax GST or other excise taxes they would be paying if they were working. That person in turn is drawing either unemployment insurance benefits or welfare from one of our provincial or territorial governments.

What a human waste, just in terms of the dollars and cents that worker costs this country and loses this country in terms of being unemployed. This does not even include the human cost, the human misery of someone walking the unemployment lines in this country, trying to find a job and applying time and time again

and being turned down time and time again by employers. The human cost is not even measurable but that is the cost of the policy of the government across the way.

Why address the debt, the human costs, the cost to the government and the cost to the country? We should also address the debt because it threatens the government's ability to act. When one-third of our tax dollar, when one-third of our budget goes to pay the interest on the national debt that leaves very little money to pursue employment and social programs.

A large part of the debt is owed to wealthy people and when the deficit goes up in many cases it is a transfer of wealth to the wealthy, creating more inequality and inequity.

Why address the debt? If we do not address the debt we are not going to get the bankers off our backs. And when the bankers are on our backs we are not going to have the money to create new social programs. We are not going to have the money to protect our social programs, the Canada Pension Plan or the medicare we have today. Those are the reasons why we have to address the debt.

We must address the debt because more and more of our debt is now being held offshore by foreigners. Some 22.5 per cent of the federal debt today is held by foreigners. A few years ago it was well under 10 per cent of the federal debt being held by foreigners but today more of that money is going out to Paris, Zurich, New York and Chicago. There might be some wealthy Republican in Phoenix, Arizona driving a Cadillac who is clipping his coupons and making money off a provincial government or the federal government of this country.

Finally, on the provincial level, some 35 per cent of the debt is now owed to foreigners.

• (2155)

There are many things we can do. We can be spending more wisely, spending money on job creation, bringing down interest rates, cancelling things such as the helicopter program, cutting out many of the subsidies for big business in this country.

Those are things we can do. If we do not do it we are going to see Conservative governments in the future attacking social programs. We are already seeing Preston Manning talking about this across the west, attacking social programs, old age pensions, the Canada Pension Plan and eventually medical care.

Those are some of the reasons why we should be addressing the debt. I would like to leave the rest of my time for my friend from Okanagan.

Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (Okanagan—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, I do thank my colleague for the opportunity to share the time with him, because this is a very important matter of debate.

The fact is that for the last four years we have found ourselves in the midst of the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement. What we have found is a nation that has been racked by a protracted recession, a nation that has been burdened by a spiralling national debt and a nation that has experienced a painful and extended restructuring of its economy.

There has been a growing sense of desperation in this country. There is a sense that something must be done to free us from the kind of economic straitjacket that threatens to strangle our economy and also our ability to control our national destiny.

In the past four years we have witnessed a dramatic decline in job creation in Canada. The increase in the number of unemployed in this country has exceeded 530,000. The national unemployment rate has climbed to an unprecedented high of 11.6 per cent. There are 1.6 million Canadians out of work.

This recession is different from other recessions. The fact is that a substantial number of the jobs that have been lost will not come back. They are gone for good. Sixty to 70 per cent of the jobs in Canada's manufacturing sector are gone for good because the plants have simply closed up and moved south of the border. That has been the reality of the free trade agreement.

Since the FTA has come into effect our industrial base has been seriously eroded in virtually every sector. We see factories all over Canada curtailing operations, being abandoned, moving south of the border, or simply being converted to distribution and storage functions. The most immediate effect of the free trade agreement has been the deindustrialization of Canada.

As Peter C. Newman said a while back in *Maclean's*, we are about to become the only country in recorded history to actually reverse the traditional evolution from underdevelopment to a manufacturing economy.

In the list of the top 13 industrial powers in *The Economist* registered in 1991, Canada stood dead last. Its position has not changed much since then in terms of its economic output. By May of last year we had lost over 568,000 jobs in our goods producing sector since the free trade agreement was signed.

In 1980 Canadian manufacturers served some 73 per cent of our domestic market but by 1991, to show how it has changed, that percentage was down to some 56 per cent. Something has clearly gone wrong with our national economy.

We all know that the bottom line of the production of any economy is its gross domestic product. That is simply the total value of all goods and services that are produced. When we look at information from StatsCan in the three years before the free trade agreement came into effect our GDP grew by an average of 12.5 per cent. In the three years subsequent to the FTA coming in that growth had virtually collapsed to a minuscule 0.1 per cent growth.

The question has to be asked: what is going on? Canada was supposed to have benefited from free trade. The agreement was supposed to have opened up new market opportunities. We were supposed to have gained access to that great American market. What it turns out to be is that the FTA is really more about where new investment was going to locate rather than in obtaining any greater access to American markets.

Canadians were repeatedly told that the free trade agreement would produce new investment, new jobs and greater economic activity. What they were not told was that it would all be south of the border.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): It being ten o'clock, it is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 81(16) to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the business of supply.

The question is on the motion of the President of the Treasury Board respecting Vote 1. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Call in the members.

• (2220)

And the division bells having rung:

Madam Deputy Speaker: Before proceeding with the taking of the division on the motion, I would like to tell the House that our Speaker was released today from the hospital.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Madam Deputy Speaker: He will be recuperating in British Columbia for a few weeks. He asked me to thank each and every one of you for your prayers and for your good wishes. He hopes to see us all very soon.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 504*)

YEAS

Members

Anderson	Andre
Atkinson	Attewell
Beatty	Belsher
Bernier	Bertrand
Bird	Bjornson
Blackburn (Jonquière)	Blais
Blenkarn	Bosley
Bouchard (Roberval)	Brightwell
Cadieux	Casey
Chadwick	Chartrand
Clark (Yellowhead)	Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Clifford	Cole
Collins	Cooper
Corbeil	Côté
Couture	Danis
Darling	DeBlois
de Cotret	Della Noce

Desjardins
Domm
Duplessis
Fee
Ferland
Fretz
Gibeau
Greene
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hicks
Hogue
Horner
Hughes
James
Johnson
Jourdenais
Koury
Larrivée
Littlechild
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming—French River)
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
Mayer
McDermid
McLean
Monteith
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Plourde
Redway
Reimer
Richardson
Roy-Arcelin
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Siddon
Soetens
Stevenson
Tétreault
Thompson
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vincent
White
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Winegard
Dobbie
Dorin
Epp
Feltham
Fontaine
Friesen
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Guilbault
Hawkes
Hockin
Holtmann
Horning
Jacques
Jelinek
Joncas
Kempling
Langlois
Lewis
Loiselle
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacKay
Marin
Masse
McCreath
McKnight
Merrithew
Moore
Oberle
Paproski
Porter
Reid
Ricard
Robitaille
Saint-Julien
Shields
Sobeski
Sparrow
Tardif
Thacker
Thorkelson
Tremblay (Lotbinière)
Van De Walle
Vien
Weiner
Wilbee
Worthy—127

NAYS

Members

Allmand
Anawak
Arseneault
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bellemare
Bevilacqua
Blaikie
Breaugh
Caccia
Clancy
Dingwall
Duhamel
Finestone
Fontana
Fulton
Gaffney
Gardiner
Grey (Beaver River)
Harb
Harvey (Edmonton East)
Hovdebo
Jordan
Althouse
Angus
Assad
Bélair
Benjamin
Black
Boudria
Brewin
Catterall
Crawford
Duceppe
Ferguson
Flis
Foster
Funk
Gagliano
Gauthier
Guarnieri
Harvard
Heap
Hunter
Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kristiansen
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee
MacLaren
Maheu
Marchi
Martin (Lasalle—Émard)
McGuire
Milliken
Nault
Nunziata
Ouellet
Peterson
Pickard
Rideout
Robinson
Rompkey
Speller
Tobin
Venne
Wappel
Kindy
Langan (Mission—Coquitlam)
Leblanc (Longueuil)
MacAulay
MacWilliam
Manley
Marleau
McCurdy
Mifflin
Mitchell
Nowlan
Nystrom
Parent
Phinney
Proud
Riis
Rocheleau
Skelly (North Island—Powell River)
Stewart
Vanclief
Waddell
Young (Acadie—Bathurst)—88

PAIRED MEMBERS

Berger
Copps
Edwards
Hopkins
Vézina
Charest
Dick
Halliday
Turner (Vancouver Quadra)
Walker

• (2225)

Madam Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)) moved:

That the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1994, laid upon the table Thursday, February 25, 1993, except the items disposed of earlier this day and less the amounts voted in Interim Supply, be concurred in.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (A)

Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)) moved:

That the Supplementary Estimates (A) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1994, laid upon the table Tuesday, May 25, 1993, be concurred in.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

Motion agreed to.

• (2230)

Mr. Loiselle moved that Bill C-134, an act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of Canada for the financial year ending March 31, 1994, be read the first time and printed.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 69(1), the motion is deemed adopted.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

Mr. Loiselle moved that the bill be read the second time and referred to Committee of the Whole.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Paproski in the chair.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. House in Committee of the Whole on Bill C-134, an act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of Canada for the financial year ending March 31, 1994.

Shall clause 2 carry?

Clause 2 agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall clause 3 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

Clause 3 agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall clause 4 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

Clause 4 agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall clause 5 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

Clause 5 agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall clause 6 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

Clause 6 agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall Schedule A carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

Schedule A agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall Schedule B carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

Schedule B agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall clause 1 carry.

Mr. David Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond): Mr. Chairman, can the President of the Treasury Board give assurances to this House that the bill is in the usual form of a supply bill with no additions or no alterations?

Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)): Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to inform the hon. member and the House that the form of this bill is the same as that passed in the previous years.

Clause 1 agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall the preamble carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

Preamble agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall the title carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. Loiselle moved that the bill be concurred in.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Loiselle moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.

* * *

• (2235)

[*Translation*]

CANADA LABOUR CODE

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed from Tuesday, June 1, consideration of Bill C-101, an act to amend the Canada Labour Code and the Public Service Staff Relations Act, as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 45(5)(a), the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred division on Motion No. 3 at report stage of Bill C-101, an act to amend the Canada Labour Code and the Public Service Staff Relations Act.

The House divided on Motion No. 3, which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 505)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Anawak
Arseneault
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bellemare
Bevilacqua
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Boudria
Brewin
Catterall
Crawford
Duceppe
Ferguson
Flis
Foster
Funk
Gagliano
Gauthier
Guarnieri
Harvard
Heap
Hunter
Keyes
Kindy
Langan (Mission—Coquitlam)
Leblanc (Longueuil)
MacAulay
MacWilliam
Manley
Marleau
McCurdy
Mifflin
Mitchell
Nunziata
Ouellet
Peterson
Pickard
Rideout
Robinson
Rompkey
Skelly (North Island—Powell River)
Stewart
Vanclief
Waddell
Young (Acadie—Bathurst)—89

Althouse
Angus
Assad
Bélair
Benjamin
Black
Blaikie
Breaugh
Caccia
Clancy
Dingwall
Duhamel
Finestone
Fontana
Fulton
Gaffney
Gardiner
Grey (Beaver River)
Harb
Harvey (Edmonton East)
Hovdebo
Jordan
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kristiansen
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee
MacLaren
Maheu
Marchi
Martin (Lasalle—Émard)
McGuire
Milliken
Nault
Nystrom
Parent
Phinney
Proud
Riis
Rocheleau
Saint-Julien
Speller
Tobin
Venne
Wappel

NAYS

Members

Anderson
Atkinson
Beatty
Bernier
Bird
Blais
Bosley
Brightwell
Casey
Chartrand
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Côté
Danis
DeBlois
Della Noce
Dobbie
Dorin
Epp
Feltham
Fontaine
Friesen
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Guilbault
Hawkes
Hockin
Holtmann
Horning
Jacques
Jelinek
Joncas
Kempling
Langlois
Lewis
Loiselle
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacKay
Marin
Masse
McCreath
McKnight
Merrithew
Moore
Oberle
Paproski
Porter
Reid
Ricard
Robitaille
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Siddon
Soetens
Stevenson
Tétreault
Thompson
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vincent
White
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Winegard

Andre
Attewell
Belsher
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blenkarn
Bouchard (Roberval)
Cadieux
Chadwick
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clifford
Collins
Corbeil
Couture
Darling
de Cotret
Desjardins
Domm
Duplessis
Fee
Ferland
Fretz
Gibeau
Greene
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hicks
Hogue
Horner
Hughes
James
Johnson
Jourdenais
Koury
Larrivée
Littlechild
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming—French River)
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
Mayer
McDermid
McLean
Monteith
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Plourde
Redway
Reimer
Richardson
Roy-Arcelin
Shields
Sobeski
Sparrow
Tardif
Thacker
Thorkelson
Tremblay (Lotbinière)
Van De Walle
Vien
Weiner
Wilbee
Worthy—125

PAIRED MEMBERS

Berger	Charest
Copps	Dick
Edwards	Halliday
Hopkins	Turner (Vancouver Quadra)
Vézina	Walker

Madam Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Hon. Marcel Danis (Minister of Labour) moved that the bill, as amended, be concurred in.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt this motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

Motion agreed to.

Madam Deputy Speaker: It being 10.44 p.m. the House stands adjourned until tomorrow morning at 10 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

The House adjourned at 10.44 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, June 3, 1993

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

ACCESS TO INFORMATION ACT

TABLING OF REPORT OF INFORMATION COMMISSIONER

Madam Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to table the report of the Information Commissioner for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1993, pursuant to section 38 of the Access to Information Act.

[*English*]

Pursuant to Standing Order 32(5) this document is permanently referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Solicitor General.

* * *

STATE OF CANADA'S FORESTS

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT

Hon. Frank Oberle (Minister of Forestry): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour today to table, in both official languages, the third annual report to Parliament on the state of Canada's forests. The year 1992 will be remembered as a year of transition and an important threshold in the history of Canadian forestry.

In March 1992 the many different groups with an interest in our forests finalized a new national forest strategy. A broad coalition of Canadians signed a new national forest accord. In June I announced the selected sites for a nation-wide network of model forests which will be extended internationally. The work carried out in these model forests will provide an invaluable stimulus to the development and practice of sustainable development in Canada's forests.

It was also a year of change in markets for forest products as consumers became increasingly concerned over the environmental implications of their purchases.

Finally, 1992 will also be remembered as the year that saw the issue of global forest management assume a new profile on the international stage. These topics are all-important features in my 1992 report to Parliament.

The report also includes updates on the series of economic and environmental indicators developed by my department to objectively measure the progress being made by Canada's forest community in improving environmental quality and economic productivity.

The report presents new information on the national forest account, which balances the additions and the depletions made to our commercial forests over the last 10 years. The data in this account is very encouraging and underlines our progress in revitalizing our most important natural resource.

* * *

[*Translation*]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Charles A. Langlois (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and to Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 14 petitions.

[*Editor's Note: See today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

• (1010)

[*English*]

ENERGY, MINES AND RESOURCES

THIRD REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Al Johnson (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the third report of the Standing Committee on Energy, Mines and Resources.

This report recommends that the government engage a private sector auditor to audit past oil and gas production from the Indian lands. It also recommends that the Auditor General do a value for money audit of the federal government's management of this aspect and that the federal government quickly adopt the amendments to the oil and gas regulations already negotiated with the First Nations.

Finally, it recommends that the federal government and the First Nations negotiate an early resolution of the issue of transferring control over oil and gas resources and/or revenues and that those negotiations be based on the principle that with control goes responsibility.

As this is probably the last report of the standing committee in this session I would particularly like to thank the members who have participated for their excellent work and the support that they have given to the committee.

Also I would like to thank the clerk, Mr. Stephen Knowles, and the researchers who have helped so much in the preparation of this and other reports.

* * *

BILL C-116

REPORT OF SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE

Mr. Don Blenkarn (Mississauga South): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the report of the special joint committee on Bill C-116, an act to provide for greater certainty in the reconciliation of the personal interests and duties of office of public office holders, to establish a conflict of interests commission, to amend the Parliament of Canada Act and to make consequential amendments to other acts.

The special joint committee reports that Bill C-116 should not be further proceeded with.

I was the chairman of the joint committee studying Bill C-43 last winter and spring. That committee reported to the House last June. The unanimous report of that committee included a draft bill. The essence of that report was disclosure. The government received the report and the committee felt that the government understood the report.

Unfortunately Bill C-116 is a confusing bill that attempts to resurrect Bill C-43. The committee unanimously believes the philosophy contained in Bill C-116 and Bill C-43, indeed the nature of the bill in total, is so wrong as to create a situation where the committee unanimously recommends to this House that Bill C-116 not be proceeded with.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. This is perhaps one of the most unusual committee reports that the House has been seized with in a very long time.

I would like to take the opportunity to indicate that members of the committee from all sides of the House were unanimous about this bill. I want to compliment all members from all political parties and in both Houses who worked on this unanimous report for the thorough work they have done.

At the staff level we were fortunate to have the highest calibre of experts we could get. In no way do I or anyone else who sat on this committee hold any member of the committee responsible for the demise of that bill. The situation that we are living with today is an unfortunate one, given the years that have been spent on this issue by many members of this House.

* * *

BILL C-126

REPORT OF LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

Mr. Rob Nicholson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister of State (Agriculture)): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the report of the legislative committee on Bill C-126, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Young Offenders Act, in both official languages.

This is the anti-stalking legislation which also makes changes that give more protection to children. There were half a dozen changes made at the committee, all of which strengthened the bill.

BILL C-85

REPORT OF LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

Mr. Doug Fee (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the report of the legislative committee on Bill C-85, an act respecting the control of psychoactive substances and their precursors and to amend the Criminal Code, the Food and Drugs Act and the Proceeds of Crime (money laundering) Act and repeal the Narcotic Control Act in consequence thereof, with amendments, in both official languages.

* * *

• (1015)

HEALTH AND WELFARE, SOCIAL AFFAIRS, SENIORS AND THE STATUS OF WOMEN

SEVENTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Ms. Barbara Greene (Don Valley North): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the seventh report of the Standing Committee on Health and Welfare, Social Affairs, Seniors and the Status of Women, relating to a study of elderly abuse.

The committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to the report within 150 days.

* * *

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

NINTH AND TENTH REPORTS OF STANDING JOINT COMMITTEE

Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table the ninth report of the Standing Joint Committee on Scrutiny of Regulations.

In this report the joint committee reaffirms its firm opposition to the grant of individual exemptions from the application of subordinate laws without express authorization from Parliament. This practice was last denounced by our committee in 1977 as being both illegal and subversive of constitutional government.

The adoption of this report was prompted by the apparent renewal by the executive of its claim to have the power to dispense with the application of subordinate legislation in favour of individuals or in specific circumstances. That authority can only expressly be granted by Parliament.

The report refers to two cases in particular: a provision of the Income Tax Act regulations and the 1990 Kemano completion project guidelines order.

The committee also expresses its firm disagreement with the recent *obiter dicta* in a ruling of the Federal Court of Appeal which appears to endorse the executive's claim to have such a power of dispensation.

I am disappointed at the apparent lack of attention of that court to the constitutional principles outlined in our report. They are the rule of law, the supremacy of Parliament and the express prohibition of such exemptions in section 12 in the 1689 Bill of Rights, which is a corner stone of our Canadian Constitution.

I also have the honour to present the tenth report of the Standing Joint Committee on Scrutiny of Regulations. In this report the committee recalls that in its response to a 1987 report by the joint committee, the government had undertaken to introduce legislation to retroactively validate certain otherwise invalid proclamations issued under section 4 of the Indian Act.

The joint committee wished to draw the attention of the House to the fact that it continues to regard the proclamations as illegal and that the undertaking given five years ago by the government remains unfulfilled.

We find it regrettable that the matters raised in the sixth report remain unaddressed and would express the hope that the government will in the near future and without the need for further action by the committee introduce legislation to retroactively validate these proclamations and questions.

[*Editor's Note: See today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

* * *

PETITIONS

CHILD POVERTY

Mr. Rob Nicholson (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition signed by dozens of residents of the city of Niagara Falls.

These residents are concerned about the problem of child poverty and its debilitating effect on children and on all of society.

They ask this Parliament to reaffirm its commitment to the elimination of child poverty by the year 2000, and I certainly agree with that.

TAXATION

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, the first petition I have the honour to present is from petitioners who ask that child care deductions be deductible from income tax, particularly for families with special needs children and especially for single parent families.

Some children with disabilities require special facilities and services and these can be extremely costly. These petitioners believe, as I do, that the current laws are unfair, insensitive and can be deemed discriminatory.

They ask that these be reviewed and they hope that the government will do so. I think it is a laudable request.

• (1020)

[*Translation*]

OLD AGE SECURITY

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I wish to present another petition. The petitioners ask that the indexing of seniors' pensions reflect the needs of that age group. They indicate that indexing does not reflect those people's financial needs at this time. They find that often seniors who receive pensions, even with the supplement that is available to them, live in poverty. As you know, many seniors live below the poverty line. They say that many seniors are in a critical situation due to lack of income.

[*English*]

SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES RESEARCH COUNCIL

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, in this final instance, you will know that the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council was created in 1977 to respond to certain needs in Canadian society.

Some of our greatest challenges are issues such as poverty, employment equity, and unemployment.

These petitioners ask that the current plans of the government to merge the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council with the Canada Council be put off. They ask that it be studied again and that a decision be taken. I concur with their request.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Charles A. Langlois (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and to Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CURRENCY ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-124, an act to amend the Currency Act, as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee.

Hon. Doug Lewis (for the Minister of State (Finance and Privatization)) moved that the bill be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): When will the bill be read the third time? By leave, now?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Lee: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, can I take it that Bill C-124 was reported as amended and concurred in? I did not detect that in Your Honour's remarks.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): The hon. member is right. The bill at report stage as amended is carried.

Mr. Lewis (for the Minister of State (Finance and Privatization)) moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Don Blenkarn (Mississauga South): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to broaden the ability of the government that holds approximately, if everything was converted into Canadian dollars including our gold holdings, about $20 billion worth of our assets.

• (1025)

This would enable us to better manage those assets by investing them not just in the restricted way that currently is in the bill in assets of the United States. It would enable us to purchase securities more broadly of German or Japanese origin in order to increase the income from the exchange fund.

The exchange fund is a very substantial bit of money, $20 billion or so, and we have to borrow that money on markets. It is important that as far as possible the exchange fund carry itself. In that sense the government is getting considerably better investment potential from the exchange fund with the amended bill as now presented for third reading.

Two amendments were made in committee moved by the Official Opposition and supported by the government. The first amendment involves the publication in *The Canada Gazette* of currencies eligible for exchange fund investment and the designation of the criteria used for the government and financial institutions.

We believe that making this information public will underscore the point that Canada's reserves are invested only in the soundest of currency assets belonging to the strongest economies in the world. It will further show that the broadening of investment to include government supported institutions poses no further additional credit risks.

The second amendment involves publication in *The Canada Gazette* of the minister's agent and derivative products held in the fund. It should be noted in this context the Bank of Canada has been the agent for the government since the exchange fund was created in 1954. No change in this designation is contemplated nor do I say desired. This clause does however provide for public notice should there be any change in the future.

With regard to derivatives, a number of the main derivative products are already spelled out in the bill. However some additional flexibility is needed because the capital markets are evolving quite quickly. We believe it is important and appropriate to have a means of communicating the evolving strategy of the government in this area. I want to make it clear that in the case of derivatives the highest quality credit standards will continue to be maintained.

This is an important bill and should substantially increase the returns on the exchange fund. I think that is good for all of us.

Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River): Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Mississauga South has done a very good job in describing precisely what this bill now involves with the amendments. I would only want to add an explanation to his quite comprehensive remarks.

The thought behind the amendments which were made at committee relate to the unfolding expansion in the number of products and the type of investments that the Bank of Canada as agent for the Government of Canada would want to be in a position to use when it dealt in the world financial markets in protecting the Canadian currency.

The bill authorizes increased flexibility in terms of the maturities of the instruments in which the bank may invest as agent. It also appears to create greater flexibility in terms of designation of who may carry on this work for the minister. In theory it can go beyond the Bank of Canada but there is not any present intention to do that as I understand it.

The number of products or financial instruments that may be invested in will also be expanded. In the face of that expansion of authority and flexibility we have asked and obtained a statutory requirement of increased reporting back to the public through *The Canada Gazette*. There would be publication of those ministerial designations of the units of account of agents and of the derivative product or instrument in which the bank will invest the Canadian or other assets that it has.

• (1030)

We are all hopeful that with this new flexibility the Bank of Canada will maintain its traditionally very conservative investment portfolio. I am sure it will and that it has every intention of doing that and in so doing it will advance the financial interest of the Canadian taxpayer.

Mr. Ian Waddell (Port Moody—Coquitlam): On behalf of the New Democratic Party I am pleased to rise to support these amendments. They are technical amendments. If they will help the Canadian currency in any way, we are pleased to support them.

I am a little less sure about helping the Bank of Canada in any way, given as my hon. friend the chair of the finance committee must have also noticed in yesterday's newspaper. I found it very interesting that according to the newspaper, Mr. Dodge, who I believe is now the deputy minister, said that the bank put the squeeze on the Canadian economy because of the economy being overheated, I think in 1988 and 1989, especially the Ontario economy. It squeezed it a bit too much and put it into a recession.

Those are not his words about putting it into a recession, but his words were: "As a result of what the bank did, there was an adjustments problem". That surely is the understatement of the decade. An adjustments problem, meaning a major recession in Canada, 12 per cent unemployment, 25 per cent employment among youth, a lot of hardship and poverty and tremendous problems for the country.

We on this side of the House are not too keen about the Bank of Canada's track record in the last little while. However, these are technical amendments and so we are pleased to be able to agree to them. I will keep the rest of the debate for later.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.

* * *

SEIZED PROPERTY MANAGEMENT ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-123, an act respecting the management of certain property seized or restrained in connection with certain offences, the disposition of certain property on the forfeiture thereof and the sharing of the proceeds of disposition therefrom in certain circumstances, as reported (with amendments) by the Standing Committee on Justice and Solicitor General.

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): There are two motions in amendment set down on the Notice Paper for the report stage of Bill C-123, an act respecting the management of certain property seized or restrained in connection with certain offences, the disposition of certain property on the forfeiture thereof and the sharing of the proceeds of disposition therefrom in certain circumstances.

[*Translation*]

Motion No. 1, standing in the name of the hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam, and Motion No. 2, standing in the name of the Minister of Justice, will be grouped for debate and voted on as follows:

(a) if Motion No. 1 carries, it will not be necessary to vote on Motion No. 2;

(b) if Motion No. 1 is negatived, it will be necessary to vote on Motion No. 2.

I shall now submit Motions Nos. 1 and 2 to the House.

[*English*]

MEASURE TO ENACT

Mr. Ian Waddell (Port Moody—Coquitlam) moved:

Motion No. 1

That Bill C-123 be amended in clause 16 by striking out lines 7 to 9 at page 11 and substituting the following therefor:

"shall be credited seventy per cent to the Debt Servicing and Reduction Account established by the Debt Servicing and Reduction Account Act and applied thirty per cent to supplement the funding of crime prevention programs administered in whole or in part by the Attorney General."

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marcel Danis (for the Minister of Justice) moved:

Motion No. 2

That Bill C-123 be amended in Clause 16 by striking out lines 7 to 9 at page 11 and substituting the following therefor:

"shall be credited to such account in the accounts of Canada as is prescribed."

• (1035)

[*English*]

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, this is the proceeds of crime bill in which property from crime is forfeited to the government. It deals with how that is to happen, how it is to be shared with the provinces and so on.

I know the figures vary. One figure being bandied about is $20 million. I have heard the figure $60 million and others. I will operate under the figure of $20 million. It is a substantial amount of money.

I am the justice critic in the New Democratic Party. We are not opposed to the bill, but we are very much opposed to what the government is going to do with the proceeds of crime. We think the proceeds of crime should go to crime prevention. That is what my amendment is about. It is very simple. The proceeds of crime should go into crime prevention, or at least part of it.

The government wants some money for debt reduction. It could put 70 per cent of the proceeds of crime into debt reduction but keep a part of the money for crime prevention. That is what my amendment says. The reason, as I will explain in my speech, is very important because it follows a principle set out in a unanimous report of the justice committee of this House of Commons called *Crime Prevention in Canada—Towards a National Strategy*, dated February 1993.

Recommendation No. 3 of the report states that we should spend some money on crime prevention and take some money from the proceeds of crime. It is very simple, but let us look at the bill and deal with the technicalities. Clause 16 reads:

> At the prescribed times, all amounts credited to the Proceeds Account that are not shared pursuant to sections 10 and 11, less such amounts as are reserved
>
> (a) for future losses,
>
> (b) to pay claims arisings from undertakings given by the Attorney General pursuant to subsections 462.32(6) and 462.33(7) of the Criminal Code, and
>
> (c) for ongoing expenses,
>
> shall be credited to the Debt Servicing and Reduction Account established by the Debt Servicing and Reduction Account Act.

The government proposes to amend this point and put them, as I understand it, into the general revenues. Whether it is debt reduction or into the general revenues, it still does not meet the test of the justice committee. I have proposed a change to this clause. My motion states that this money:

> "shall be credited seventy per cent to the Debt Servicing and Reduction Account established by the Debt Servicing and Reduction Account Act and applied thirty per cent to supplement the funding of crime prevention programs administered in whole or in part by the Attorney General".

We are not interfering with the provinces. It is the Attorney General of Canada. We in the NDP want the government to commit some of the proceeds from crime to crime prevention, and here is why.

The report I mentioned of the justice committee was an all-party report. The committee was chaired by the hon. member for Mississauga West. Recommendation No. 3 reads:

> The committee recommends that a share of the moneys forfeited as proceeds of crime be allocated to crime prevention activities and that the federal government allocate 1 per cent a year of the current federal budget for police courts and corrections to crime prevention over a five-year period.
>
> At the end of five years, Canada should spend 5 per cent of the current criminal justice budget on crime prevention.

The report clearly says that moneys forfeited as proceeds of crime should be allocated to crime prevention activities. My friends in the government say they will do that, but will they do it? We cannot be sure. We do not know. The amendment says a certain amount of moneys will be allocated.

• (1040)

I draw attention to recommendations Nos. 1 and 2 of the same justice report. I think this is a great report. It is a great step forward in fighting crime in Canada. Here is what it says:

> The committee recommends that the federal government, in co-operation with the provinces and municipalities, take on a national leadership role in crime prevention and develop a national crime prevention policy.

That is what I want to see, a national crime prevention policy. Money is needed to pay for it, right? The distinguished hon. member from Mississauga, the chair of the finance committee who is in the House, keeps telling the House: "Look at the money. You need money to pay for these programs".

The crime prevention policy should set out the following principles and initiatives:

> a. Crime prevention will be included in the mandates of the federal departments
>
> b. All levels of government are responsible for crime and they must work together

Crime occurs in communities and priorities concerning crime prevention are best determined at the local level. The primary approach taken to prevent crime and create safer communities entails a co-ordinated, multi-disciplinary effort to address the root causes of crime.

Finally:

> e. Prevention measures include law enforcement, community-based policing, social development and reduction of criminal opportunities.

Recommendation No. 2 which goes along with this says:

> The committee recommends the federal government, in consultation with the provinces and territories and the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, support the development of a national crime prevention council.

The council's job would be to promote safety, to provide the federal government with advice and to gather and analyse information.

We found that while the community of Coquitlam may be doing some great stuff in community-based policing, the community of Montreal did not know about it. Whereas the community of Montreal may have been doing some wonderful work in neighbourhood programs, the community of Coquitlam did not know about it.

Therefore we want to bring them together. We do not want to reinvent the wheel. We will do it through the national crime prevention council.

As a matter of fact the present Minister of Justice who has the right intentions and who is a good man has started the beginnings of a national crime prevention council. We have to give it some money. What better way to do it than to earmark some of those moneys from the drug dealers, criminals and so on. When we get that money it should be put it back into crime prevention.

They also say that the national crime prevention council should provide training, research, evaluation and public education on the prevention of crime. That takes money. They say that it should provide funding assistance to local governments and community organizations to implement safety initiatives.

In my own riding of Port Moody—Coquitlam a number of people are involved in Block Watch and Crime Stoppers. Even the insurance industry is now involved in community programs. The local police, the social workers, the teachers, everybody wants to get involved in crime prevention and they are doing it on the community basis. That is where it is really happening. They need some funding.

Here is a way to get some funding:

> f. include membership from federal, provincial and municipal governments, and professionals and practitioners involved in crime prevention

This is a great report of the justice committee. It is in the right direction. It received critical acclaim in the press. I will remind the government once again that recommendation No. 3 says:

> The committee recommends that a share of the moneys forfeited as proceeds of crime be allocated to crime prevention activities

That is exactly what my motion does and that is why the government should support this motion. It is the litmus test of how much this government is committed to crime prevention.

When the report came out some of the sceptics, the media and various people in Canada said: "We do not believe it. This government is actually doing something right." They said: "We will wait and see".

They take one step forward and two steps backward. That seems to be this government. Daniel Drolet who is a distinguished journalist writing recently in *The Ottawa Citizen* said the other day:

> Some critics wonder how committed the government is to crime prevention.

Now we have the answer. This is how committed it is. It is missing an opportunity to show its commitment.

• (1045)

I see my friend in the House, the distinguished critic for the Liberal Party. I look at the Liberal policy paper on crime prevention. It says that the Liberal Party is committed to money going for crime prevention. It also cites with approval the justice committee.

I see reported in *Vancouver Sun* of June 1 my friend, the member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys, the justice critic of the Liberal Party quoted as saying this: "He thinks it is a lousy idea to funnel the proceeds of crime back into prevention". He wants a separate budget. The journalist asked: "When is that going to happen?" That is a good question because it is not going to happen. I hope the member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys and the Liberal Party change their minds. Right now we have the Liberal Party and the Conservative Party not wanting to follow the unanimous report—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Order, please. The hon. member's time has expired.

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, I thought I had 20 minutes for this.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): I remind the hon. member that as shown in the Projected Order of Business and also in the Order Paper, speeches at report stage are limited to 10 minutes. Therefore time is up.

[*English*]

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, I would make a request to the House that I be allowed to take one minute to just sum up. I will not abuse it.

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Waddell: They are in fine spirits, they give me much more than I deserve sometimes.

In closing I will say this because I want to hear from the hon. member from the Liberal Party and the government. Perhaps they will accept my amendment.

The Ottawa Citizen has an editorial today saying the Tories are missing a good investment, that this is a smart investment. It says: "The committee recommended more action to prevent crime. By identifying people at risk of becoming criminals, kids in poverty and abusive homes with bad schooling, governments can save on both crime and punishment".

I think the committee report was right. We have to earmark that money. I only ask that it be 30 per cent of the federal moneys, but it will be in there. It will be earmarked and it will be a commitment to crime prevention. It may not be historic but it will be important and it will show that the government is prepared to take seriously its own unanimous report of a House of Commons committee.

I urge the members of the House to support this amendment. I am not trying to delay the bill. I think the bill could get through today. I would like to see a commitment from the government. If I cannot get my motion by some miracle and it does not pass, I hope the government will give at least a verbal commitment from the ministry that moneys will go to the crime prevention because it is very important in Canada. Canadians want us to fight crime and the way to fight crime is to prevent it in the first place. The NDP says get tough with violent criminals, but we also say put money into crime prevention, especially among young people and stop crime from happening in the first place.

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, I will speak on both the amendment of the government and the amendment brought forward by my friend from the New Democratic Party.

First I want to deal with the one from the government. I am rather at a loss to explain why the amendment is here. I would appreciate it if the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice could give some explanation.

With respect to the amendment of my colleague from Port Moody—Coquitlam, he is certainly wrong when he says we do not support his motion because we do. That piece that he quoted from a Vancouver newspaper is inaccurate. At no time did I ever say that using the proceeds of crime for crime prevention was a lousy idea. He and I were both members of the Standing Committee on Justice and the Solicitor General's task force on crime prevention.

• (1050)

We both supported the report. The report "calls for a share of the moneys forfeited as proceeds of crime be allocated to crime prevention". Also in our party paper on justice we advocate that some of the proceeds of crime be used to fund drug education programs, arguably another mode of crime prevention activity and crime prevention.

As the hon. member knows, I supported him on his motion in the legislative committee on using the funds from the proceeds of crime for crime prevention. That is fundamentally the thing to do. The misrepresentation arose when I was trying to explain to the journalists what the position of the government was. The position of the government was that it does not favour this even though, as the hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam has said, it goes against the report of the standing committee.

The government says it does not want to do this because it needs to be assured in a budget how much money is applicable to crime prevention. It says that if we did this from the proceeds of crime, it would be an uncertain amount and we would not have any fixed amount. If it is going to have a budget for crime prevention, it should be allotted in the estimates and should be something that everyone can rely upon.

I can understand the government's concern for wanting a fixed budget. However it is using that as a red herring. We can certainly have a budget but use the proceeds of crime for that budget. If the proceeds of crime from some event do not match what is budgeted for crime prevention, the government can supplement the amount. There is no reason it cannot be done.

As has been said, communities want crime prevention. This government used the standing committee's report on crime prevention as a linchpin for its symposium in Toronto the first week of March. If it was good enough to use as a linchpin for a symposium, why in the name of heaven can it not adopt the report?

We heard ministers at this symposium speaking time after time about how great a report this was and how we needed to work for crime prevention. But there is no commitment from the government for this report or for crime prevention.

If the government wants to have a fixed amount in the estimates, or whatever it wants to do, I can condone that as long as it is doing something for crime prevention. But it is not. It has not supported crime prevention in any sense of the word other than to speak about it and to use it as a means of glossing over the intentions and the aspirations of people who were at the symposium.

That is not good enough. There has to be a commitment. The amendment of the hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam gives teeth to what the standing committee says in its report. I support that because it is the first thing we have seen in this House as a means of having funding for crime prevention. If the government has an alternative, then have the government put it forward.

We in the Liberal Party are on record as having supported entirely the report on crime prevention by the standing committee. Why can the government not do that? Why can the government not come forward with tangible recommendations on the funding of crime prevention? It says that it does not want to support this amendment. Then fine, come forward with something it does want to do to fund crime prevention. It will not do it and you wonder what its intentions are. Does it really support crime prevention at all? There is nothing tangible to show that it does. We in the Liberal Party want something tangible and we are asking the government for something tangible. We are supporting the hon. member's amendment.

• (1055)

Mr. Rob Nicholson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister of State (Agriculture)): Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with two amendments to Bill C-123. This is the proceeds of crime bill. It is a good bill. I believe it has support on all sides of the House and I think justifiably so.

The proceeds of crime bill is part of our drug prevention scheme. I believe, and I hope other members agree, that one of the best ways to attack crime is to attack the profits of crime. Bill C-123 fits into our strategy. It provides an effective method for managing assets that have been seized by the Crown. As well, it provides a framework for sharing the proceeds of crime with other law enforcement jurisdictions.

In my riding of Niagara Falls I heard this on a number of occasions in response to questionnaires that I regularly send out to the people. When I asked them this question they said: "Yes, share it with the jurisdictions that are on the front lines and are in the business of seizing the proceeds of crime".

This is a tremendous step in the right direction. It fits in with all the other things the government is doing. Members of the opposition can stand up and say: "We are all in favour of crime prevention. We are tough on crime but we just do not like the things that the government is doing". The government is doing an awful lot in this area.

One bill that will come before Parliament in the next couple of days that I hope will get the support of everyone is the new anti-stalking legislation. It makes it a crime for individuals who want to repeatedly follow and communicate with individuals and put individuals in fear for their safety. That is a step in the right direction. I believe and hope that it will get the support of all hon. members.

However, this is just part of it. One of the other things that we are doing, since this whole question of the government's crime prevention strategy has been raised in the House this morning, is allowing for the first time in Canadian law a prohibition order against people who like to molest children. These are convicted paedophiles. We now make it possible for a lifetime ban to be imposed, keeping them from being anywhere near public parks, swimming pools and other places where children frequent.

As well, just last night, not even 12 hours ago, we changed that bill again to affect those individuals who want to participate in voluntary organizations. I am thinking of things like the Boy Scouts and the Big Brothers organizations. We put that in the bill.

All of these things are part of a larger strategy which is to rebalance the system to make sure that victims are protected and that the rights of law-abiding citizens are considered at all times. I look at the proceeds of crime bill as just part of that particular strategy.

The hon. member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys says: "Why with the government motion are you changing the present provisions which state that the proceeds of crime will immediately go to the debt servicing reduction account". This is a laudable goal by the way. The taxpayers in this country are very interested in things going to debt reduction. However he asks why we are changing that to use the wording: "The proceeds of crime shall be credited to such account in the accounts of Canada as is prescribed". This actually gives us some flexibility. We can by regulation then decide if we want different accounts or where we want it to go so that the legislation does not tie our hands and say that it must exclusively go into the debt servicing reduction account.

I will address the point the hon. member made. He said this is the way we should fund crime prevention. Make sure of a certain percentage. In his case the amendment says 30 per cent.

• (1100)

Let us just look at 1992. Let us see how that would work. The figure that was quoted this morning was that the Crown seized $20 million in the profits of crime in 1992. This is not $20 million that we have in our hands to decide what we want to do with it. That is not the case at all. Most people would be aware that when assets are seized we have to effectively manage those assets because they are still the property of the individual from whom they have been seized. The forfeiture is not final. There are appeal processes. One example was given of a resort seized by the government. We are still within the appeal process and that has been several years.

In fact if we want to talk figures $2 million was forfeited to the Crown in 1992. Consider using the scheme of the hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam where 30 per cent is directed toward drug prevention.

Mr. Waddell: No. To supplement.

Mr. Nicholson: To supplement. I will pick up with what the hon. member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys said: "If it goes down one year and up the other then the government will just fill in".

I have news for this House. I do not think it is news to the members who sit on this side. We spend an awful lot more on crime prevention than 30 per cent of $2 million and we spend more than 30 per cent of the $20 million figure that was quoted. Concerning the national strategy on drug prevention, 70 per cent of those millions of dollars committed to that is for reducing demand and trying to get at the source of the problem.

There are many worth-while projects that all of us in this House are aware of which are directed toward the very laudable goal of crime prevention.

A scheme whereby the priority is set that in one year we may have $50 million of assets that are forfeited to the Crown and the next year it is $2 million or zero is not what groups that are in this area would want. It would add an uncertainty as to what they are going to get.

I know that in the land of the NDP, money is never a problem but I believe the groups we are involved with—

Mr. Waddell: Ask the premier of Ontario.

Mr. Nicholson: I say that sincerely. I know there is no problem ever with spending money and there is no problem with cash.

I believe we have to plan these things in a manner that is responsible and will be helpful to people who are trying to work in this area and responsible to the taxpayers who are paying us. Say that in one year the Crown seizes $500 million and according to the NDP it is $470 million. If that does not accord with what it is then it says: "Just write a cheque for the extra $30 million. Top it up. Just send the cheque out".

I do not think that is a good way to do it. I believe we should evaluate each project that we get involved in to make sure it does the job of reducing the demand for drugs or that it is used for crime prevention. We should be very careful without arbitrarily making up our minds in advance as to how we are going to do this.

I am asking the House to reject the NDP amendment. I believe the government amendment is a more even-handed approach to this in saying that it may be our decision. We think we can make this amount go here to supplement or replace whatever we have but at least it is open-ended and we are not tying ourselves in with legislation by insisting that it go to the debt reduction account.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Call in the members.

The House divided on the motion, which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 506)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Anawak
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bélair
Black
Brewin
Clancy
Crawford
Ferguson
Fontana
Fulton
Gagliano
Gauthier
Harb
Heap
Hunter
Keyes
Kindy
Langdon (Essex—Windsor)
Leblanc (Longueuil)
MacLaren
MacWilliam
Manley
Marleau
Nunziata
Peterson
Pickard
Riis
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Vanclief
Volpe
Wappel
Althouse
Arseneault
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bellemare
Boudria
Caccia
Comuzzi
Duhamel
Flis
Foster
Gaffney
Gardiner
Grey (Beaver River)
Harvard
Hovdebo
Jordan
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Langan (Mission—Coquitlam)
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee
MacLellan
Maheu
Marchi
Nowlan
Nystrom
Phinney
Rideout
Rompkey
Tobin
Venne
Waddell
Young (Acadie—Bathurst)—64

NAYS

Members

Anderson
Atkinson
Beatty
Bird
Blais
Bouchard (Roberval)
Browes
Chartrand
Cole
Couture
DeBlois
Dobbie
Duplessis
Fee
Fontaine
Greene
Hockin
Horner
Jelinek
Jourdenais
Larrivée
Littlechild
MacDonald (Rosedale)
Marin
McDermid
Nicholson
Porter
Reimer
Richardson
Saint-Julien
Soetens
Tardif
Thorkelson
Van De Walle
Vien
Wilbee
Worthy—73
Andre
Attewell
Belsher
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Brightwell
Chadwick
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Côté
Danis
de Cotret
Domm
Epp
Feltham
Fretz
Hicks
Holtmann
Hughes
Johnson
Langlois
Lewis
Loiselle
MacKay
Masse
Monteith
Oberle
Redway
Ricard
Roy-Arcelin
Sobeski
Stevenson
Tétreault
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Vankoughnet
Weiner
Winegard

PAIRED MEMBERS

nil/aucun

• (1145)

Madam Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion negatived.

The next question is on Motion No. 2.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay (Québec–Est): Madam Speaker, I think you will find there is unanimous consent for applying the results of the vote we just had to the government's amendment, but in reverse.

[*English*]

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to apply the vote we just had in reverse?

[*Translation*]

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Ouellet: Madam Speaker, I would like my vote on the second motion to be registered with the opposition.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 507*)

YEAS

Members

Anderson
Atkinson
Beatty
Bird
Blais
Bouchard (Roberval)
Browes
Chartrand
Cole
Couture
DeBlois
Dobbie
Duplessis
Fee
Fontaine
Greene
Hockin
Horner
Jelinek
Jourdenais
Larrivée
Littlechild
MacDonald (Rosedale)
Marin
McDermid
Nicholson
Porter
Reimer
Richardson
Saint-Julien
Soetens
Tardif
Thorkelson
Van De Walle
Vien
Wilbee
Worthy—73

Andre
Attewell
Belsher
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Brightwell
Chadwick
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Côté
Danis
de Cotret
Domm
Epp
Feltham
Fretz
Hicks
Holtmann
Hughes
Johnson
Langlois
Lewis
Loiselle
MacKay
Masse
Monteith
Oberle
Redway
Ricard
Roy-Arcelin
Sobeski
Stevenson
Tétreault
Tremblay (Québec–Est)
Vankoughnet
Weiner
Winegard

NAYS

Members

Allmand
Anawak
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bélair
Black
Brewin
Clancy
Crawford
Ferguson
Fontana
Fulton
Gagliano
Gauthier
Harb
Heap
Hunter
Keyes
Kindy
Langdon (Essex—Windsor)
Leblanc (Longueuil)
MacLaren
MacWilliam
Manley
Marleau
Nunziata
Ouellet
Phinney
Rideout
Rompkey
Tobin
Venne
Waddell
Young (Acadie—Bathurst)—65

Althouse
Arseneault
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bellemare
Boudria
Caccia
Comuzzi
Duhamel
Flis
Foster
Gaffney
Gardiner
Grey (Beaver River)
Harvard
Hovdebo
Jordan
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Langan (Mission—Coquitlam)
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee
MacLellan
Maheu
Marchi
Nowlan
Nystrom
Peterson
Pickard
Riis
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Vanclief
Volpe
Wappel

PAIRED MEMBERS

nil/aucun

Madam Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

[*English*]

Hon. Pierre Blais (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister of State (Agriculture)) moved that the bill, as amended, be concurred in.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

Madam Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried on division.

Motion agreed to.

• (1150)

Mr. Nicholson: Madam Speaker, I think you may find unanimous consent in the House to immediately proceed with third reading of this bill.

Mr. Waddell: Madam Speaker, we would be prepared to give our consent provided that either the minister or the parliamentary secretary indicate that they would take seriously the goal of putting proceeds of crime money toward crime prevention in this country, which I think we all agree to in this House because a parliamentary committee, the justice committee, was unanimous.

If the minister or the parliamentary secretary could give some indication I would be pleased to give unanimous consent.

Mr. MacLellan: Madam Speaker, to follow up on what the member for Port Moody—Coquitlam has said, I think it is important in light of the all-party support in the standing committee report on crime prevention that we have some commitment from the government on exactly what it is going to do with the proceeds of crime. The standing committee report calls for the proceeds to go toward crime prevention. We want something from the government to support that and to give us an indication on this very important point.

Mr. Blais: My provincial counterparts and the municipalities, particularly at the symposium on crime prevention last March, agreed on the direction we are going. Negotiations are not yet completed but obviously I am listening to the message I received today and I am very sensitive to those opinions.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Kindy: Madam Speaker, I am astonished that after the amendment proposed by the NDP was negatived, members simply wanted the minister to promise that these amounts may be applied to crime prevention. I think that is unacceptable. Either he is prepared to allocate these amounts to crime prevention, or I refuse to give my consent.

[*English*]

Mr. Attewell: I wonder if we might hear from the member for Mississauga West who is chairman of the justice committee and has been very involved in this issue.

Madam Deputy Speaker: The House was asked to proceed with third reading of the bill. Consent was not given. Is it still the idea of the hon. member for Calgary that we cannot proceed with third reading? No, yes. Would the hon. member please clarify his view? No, yes, does not help me much.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Kindy: Madam Speaker, no, I do not give my consent.

[*English*]

Madam Deputy Speaker: Consent has not been given.

* * *

MISCELLANEOUS STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1993

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-125, an act to correct certain anomalies, inconsistencies, archaisms and errors in the statutes of Canada, to deal with other matters of a non-controversial and uncomplicated nature in those statutes and to repeal certain provisions of those statutes that have expired or lapsed or otherwise ceased to have effect, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Solicitor General.

• (1155)

Hon. Pierre Blais (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister of State (Agriculture)) moved that the bill be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): When shall the bill be read the third time? By leave, now?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Blais moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Rob Nicholson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister of State (Agriculture)): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-125, the Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act 1993 is a technical bill which amends a series of federal statutes. These amendments are not controversial. They do not involve the spending of public funds. They do not prejudicially affect the rights of persons and they do not

create new offences or subject a new class of persons to an existing offence.

The bill corrects anomalies, inconsistencies, archaic expressions and errors in federal statutes and deals exclusively with non-controversial matters.

The bill also repeals statutes that have ceased to have effect. The provisions of this bill were submitted as proposals to the House Standing Committee on Justice and the Solicitor General and the Senate Standing Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs last February. Both committees have examined the proposals and reported to the House and the Senate. Only proposals which have been unanimously approved by both committees are entered into this bill.

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, we did a pre-study in the Standing Committee on Justice and the Solicitor General on Bill C-125. We noted the recommendations and made suggestions. We had second reading and then went back to committee and reviewed it.

My party and I find the bill acceptable. As the parliamentary secretary has said, it is really of a technical nature.

Mr. Ian Waddell (Port Moody—Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the New Democratic Party, we are in agreement with what the parliamentary secretary and the hon. member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys has said. We are in agreement with this bill.

While I am on my feet I would just remind the hon. member from Calgary of a good quote from Mick Jagger of the Rolling Stones: "You can't always get what you want, but sometimes you might just find you get what you need". Maybe he could ponder that a little bit with respect to the proceedings in the House in the last few minutes.

In any case, we are in agreement that Bill C-125 should go through. It is basically technical and cleans up some statutes.

Mr. Alex Kindy (Calgary Northeast): Mr. Speaker, I think if it is simply a bill to clean up statutes it is certainly in order to pass it. I do not know what the justice committee studied but apparently it made some corrections. I suppose they are right.

In answer to what my friend from B.C. said, I think if one has an amendment one has to believe in that amendment. That amendment was defeated and we did not get a commitment from the minister. A commitment from the minister is not worth the paper it is written on therefore I cannot support and give unanimous consent to pass the bill.

As far as the present one goes, I have no problems with its passage.

• (1200)

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, I want to use the next few moments to bring something to the attention of this House while speaking on Bill C-125.

A few moments ago we were debating Bill C-123. We dealt with an amendment proposed by the hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam and I believe the amendment he was proposing to that bill was good. It was worthy of support. I supported it and so did my colleagues.

All members of Parliament should remember that there is a difference between a good bill and one that is already good which we want to make even better. The bill we were discussing at the time was already good and we wanted to make it better. That amendment was defeated but we still have to work on the premise that the bill was good because we initially said it was.

I live in a riding where smuggling is a terrible problem. It is taking a terrible toll on the constituents of my area. My colleague for Stormont—Dundas who represents a riding in Ontario that adjoins with mine told me of a recent auction sale in Cornwall where 250 cars were sold that had been seized because of smuggling at that port of entry. The fines right now are so low that it is a farce and we need to increase them. We need to do what is necessary to cut down smuggling and hopefully even stop it. Unless we get Bill C-123 passed in the very few days left in this Parliament, we are not going to have that.

We saw the shootings in my riding not that long ago. People were shooting at each other for control of that trade. That is terrible and it is incumbent upon all of us in the few days that we have left to pass that legislation which is so vital. That unanimous consent was refused earlier but I ask all colleagues in the House to take a few minutes to pause and reflect. Just maybe common sense will prevail and consent will be given. We will then debate that legislation and do what is good for the people of Canada and the people who I have the honour and privilege to represent in this House.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Carried on division.

Motion agreed to, read the third time and passed.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I am going to do something that is somewhat unusual. I am going to ask for unanimous consent that we revert to the bill that was denied earlier. It is unusual for an opposition member to ask for the unanimous consent to deal with a government bill but I will do that now because of the reasons I have already explained in this House. I hope that compassion and common sense will prevail and we will be able to do what I am asking.

Mr. Nicholson: Mr. Speaker, let me indicate to the House the hon. member for Calgary is quite correct that the motion from the member for Port Moody—Coquitlam was defeated. It specified a percentage of the proceeds of crime that would go to crime prevention and what would stay or otherwise, as directed by the government.

The government motion that was concurred in by the House actually opens up the possibility that the government can direct the proceeds of crime to an account to be decided upon by regulation. That is a change from the original bill that indicated that all funds that came to the Crown must go into the debt reduction account. We made a change to that.

• (1205)

I did not get an opportunity but I should have touched on the report of the standing committee. It had very impressive recommendations. Certainly the minister has an *ad hoc* committee looking at that. I expect we will probably be getting recommendations as well from the *ad hoc* committee that advises the minister as to where and how the funds should be spent. I do not want the House to be left with the impression that the door was closed on this or that this was not an outstanding report by the standing committee on justice.

I think the words of the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell should be heeded by the House. It is an excellent bill, supported on all sides of the House and the window of opportunity for passing something that our constituents have been asking for is very small. I hope all hon. members, in considering this request, will give that unanimous consent so we can move to third reading on this bill.

Mr. Kindy: Mr. Speaker, I was listening with interest to the hon. member. My experience as a former member on the justice committee is that if it is just left to regulations and the bureaucracy, the advice is never going to be followed to put the money in a fund to reduce our debt or for crime prevention.

If we are serious about this matter and if the government had been serious about this matter, it would have accepted the amendment because it was a good amendment. It was very simple for government members to vote for it because it would have directed 70 per cent of the funds to debt reduction and 30 per cent to crime prevention. If the government is still serious, it still can bring it back and have debate and so on therefore I cannot give my consent.

Mr. Angus: Mr. Speaker, I think we have to recognize that having been reported, there is no longer an option to make further amendments in this room. The other House can amend it if it so chooses. To even delay third reading in no way provides an opportunity for the government to amend the bill.

The only way we could do that is if by unanimous agreement the House reverted to report stage. I am not suggesting we do that. There comes a point in time in which we have to recognize that we tried. We did not get there, so let us move on with it.

I would encourage the hon. member to reconsider whether or not he grants unanimous consent to allow us to move this bill through third reading to get it into the other place so it can be passed into law.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: No.

EXPLOSIVES ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

Hon. Marcel Danis (for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources) moved that Bill C-107, an act to amend the Explosives Act, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee in the Natural Resources envelope.

Mr. Lee Richardson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to address my colleagues in the House of Commons on the occasion of the second reading of Bill C-107, an act to amend the Explosives Act.

First enacted in 1914, the Explosives Act is an act of public and worker safety which regulates the composition, quality and character of explosive, pyrotechnic substances and articles which contain such substances. The manufacture, importation, sale, purchase, possession and storage of such substances are also regulated under the Explosives Act. Bill C-107 is a practical piece of legislation with a very clear purpose and I will take a few minutes to elaborate on that statement.

The proposed bill contains five principal provisions. To begin with, the definition of an explosive has been rewritten for greater clarity. Furthermore, dangerous explosives being used for non-explosive purposes may be brought under the act by regulation and innocuous pyrotechnics that are best left unregulated or regulated under other legislation may be excluded by regulation.

An example of a dangerous explosive that would be pulled into the definition would be picric acid, a currently unregulated substance that is more sensitive and powerful than TNT. An example of a relatively harmless pyrotechnic that would be excluded is a Christmas cracker. In addition to improving the definition of an explosive, authority is being sought for the exemption of innocuous items in whole or in part from the provisions of the Explosives Act or regulations.

• (1210)

The net effect of these changes will be to provide the flexibility necessary for the tailoring of the degree of regulation to match the explosive. Instances of overregulation created by the current definition will be eliminated.

Second, another provision of the bill will restrict the possession of certain specialty explosives to particular individuals or groups. This will add an element of safety to the handling and use of those materials, while at the same time addressing the security issues associated with their distribution. For example, the non-military possession or use of plastic explosives will be restricted except in highly unusual circumstances in police explosive disposal units.

There remains some existing entry and arrest powers of inspectors and peace officers which are viewed to be inconsistent with the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and will be eliminated. At present inspectors may enter private dwellings without even a suspicion of wrongdoing and without a search warrant. This situation, reminiscent of a much earlier era, is intolerable in the 1990s. In recognition of the current inappropriate authority of inspectors, the changes being sought with this legislation should permit only those powers of entry and arrest which are reasonably required to protect the public from immediate danger.

Another provision of this bill will allow for the stipulation of particular conditions, licences, permits and certificates which are designed to protect property, the public and explosives workers.

Another point is it has been some time since these penalties under the act have been updated. This bill imposes increases in the fines for summary convictions that essentially offset nearly two decades of inflation. Additionally indictable offences with somewhat greater penalties have been introduced for violations which are of a serious nature.

Even with these proposed increases, the penalty structure remains less severe than that associated with other public safety related legislation. This is reflected in the long established consultative approach to regulating the explosives industry that relies on prosecution as a last resort.

In addition to the major provisions that I have just reviewed there are other improvements contained in the bill that merit discussion at this time. This bill also addresses the need to apply safety markings to explosives packages as well as to provide instructions for safe handling, storage and use. Provision for safety related markings and information is clearly of significant importance to the safety of shippers, handlers and end users of explosives products.

A further enhancement of regulatory authority involves the provision for drafting safety standards for explosives research and large-scale testing as well as for factories and magazine locations. The objective is to create a system that will require careful evaluation from a safety perspective of all operations involving higher risks such as research, testing and manufacture.

A provision to grant inspectors the power to direct the taking of safety measures to remedy contraventions of the act and regulations as it applies to the manufacture, transportation, testing or storage of explosives or the use of fireworks will enable such situations to be resolved efficiently and effectively.

The final proposed change I would like to discuss at this time pertains to charging fees for the testing and authorizing of explosives as well as providing for the recovery of costs associated with the disposal of explosives forfeited to the Crown voluntarily or as a result of a conviction of an offence under the Explosives Act. These changes are felt necessary to eliminate an unfair cost to the Canadian taxpayer.

Consultation is well known as an important exercise in any legislative initiative. I am pleased to say that 44 different bodies were consulted with prior to the tabling of Bill C-107. Federal, provincial and territorial departments, as well as police agencies who were known to have a keen interest in this legislation, were consulted not only directly but through correspondence and other meetings.

The Canadian Explosive Distributors Association, a private sector organization which represents the interests of Canadian explosive manufacturers and distributors, has had an opportunity to examine the contents of Bill C-107. I am happy to say that they are in favour of the proposed changes.

I would like to emphasize that these amendments if passed by Parliament would not have any significant impact on other businesses or private citizens. It is also expected that competitiveness in the explosives industry will be affected in a positive way in that the foundation for regulation will be more clearly stated.

• (1215)

The modernization of the Explosives Act will provide the platform necessary for the complete revision and reform of the explosives regulations. This will result in a regulatory system that is clear, concise and focused.

The proposed Bill C-107 will allow for a more efficient and effective approach to the control of explosive and pyrotechnic materials in Canada. Such modernization initiatives will contribute to greater public safety with respect to explosive items.

Surely the revisions contained in Bill C-107 are beyond argument. It would be hard to imagine anyone wanting to seriously challenge the proposed amendments which were intended to update a low profile yet important piece of legislation.

I trust that my remarks clearly illustrate that the proposed revisions to Bill C-107 are entirely pragmatic, realistic and beneficial and that they will be readily accepted by both industry and consumers.

Mr. Rex Crawford (Kent): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak on Bill C-107, the legislation that regulates the composition, quality and character of explosives in addition to their manufacture, importation, sale, purchase, possession and storage.

Bill C-107 takes into account the significant changes that have occurred in the past 20 years, including the introduction of the charter of rights. It will bring the investigatory and seizure powers into line with the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

It will also introduce other significant changes to the regulatory structure. For example, it will provide for restricting the use of certain specialty explosives to specific persons or groups and will allow the minister when issuing a licence to stipulate conditions for the protection of the public and employees. In other words, the legislation would greatly contribute to increased safety conditions of Canadians working with explosives.

As the associate energy critic for my party, I am deeply concerned about safety conditions in our mine sector in general and in coal mining in particular.

For the past months the eyes of the country have been focused on the Westray coal mine in Nova Scotia where 26 miners died tragically in an underground explosion on May 9, 1992. Ever since coal was discovered in Pictou county the price of mining there has been measured in human lives.

In recent memory alone there was the early morning explosion in 1979 in Glace Bay where 12 men died. The biggest disaster was at Springhill in 1891 when 125 men and boys were lost in an explosion. The most miraculous incident took place at Springhill again in 1956 where 36 miners were killed but 54 survived more than five days underground.

The Pictou county mines have taken more than 244 lives to date in explosions. To this grim total another 26 names were added last year.

According to historical evidence more than 2,400 lives have been lost in the Nova Scotia coal mines since 1867. Miners died in floods, were asphyxiated, were crushed by the falling rock and coal and were burned in fires and explosions.

Better than anyone else, coal miners know the perils of their profession. One of their remarkable historical achievements has been their ability to enforce rules and regulations to improve the safety of their work place.

It comes as a shocking surprise that safety concerns voiced by miners at Westray were largely ignored by the management. In the 12 months before the fatal explosion in 1992 inspectors from the Nova Scotia labour department recorded dangerous incidents and hazards in 22 reports. At the time of the blast the mine was evidently under orders to bring in a safety plan to prevent coal dust explosion.

Lethal levels of explosive methane gas and coal dust and repeated problems with collapsing roofs were regular safety concerns at the Westray mine. Miners frequently worked in dangerous conditions 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, as the mine struggled to meet production quotas. Many coal mines operate five days a week devoting the other two days to maintenance and servicing.

• (1220)

Many experienced miners left Westray for safety reasons. As one of them put it: "There were crews that said their prayers of thanks every night when they came up out of the mine. They had made it to another day".

According to evidence seized by the RCMP many reports written at the time by maintenance staff dealt with safety problems. The statement obtained from the employees further indicates that company officials were aware of safety concerns yet ordered employees to work in hazardous conditions. At the approach of the disaster's anniversary, there are no real answers yet to what happened, only more and more questions.

Another controversial case comes to mind in connection with safety measures at mine sites such as the Giant Yellowknife gold mine where nine miners were killed in a massive underground explosion last year. As a bitter strike had been bubbling over for months there was speculation that commercial explosives used in mining operations were used in a booby trap. On September 1 dynamite was planted in a building used to pump fresh air to underground workers. A week after, dynamite was used to blow up a nearby television satellite dish.

Employees sought among other things improved safety standards such as a ban on transporting explosives with workers no matter how much time or money it might save. The union claimed it believed the men were travelling through the mine with 20-kilogram bags containing powdered nitrogen mixed with diesel fuel and two boxes of detonators. While the town lived in a state of terror, confusion and anger for four months, the company did not know if it had been missing any explosives from its many underground depots because it did not keep track of the powder once it was in the mine.

If the introduced legislation helps eliminate this sort of negligence it would considerably diminish risks related to dealing with explosives at the workplace.

In closing, I would like to emphasize that safety conditions are among many other issues challenging our vital mining sector. Mining today, which accounts for about 4.4 per cent of Canada's gross national product and supports about 330,000 direct and indirect jobs, faces serious difficulties because of existing federal-provincial tax policies, environmental assessment and regulations and problems of land access and security of tenure, all of which create major investment uncertainty.

Mining exploration spending for instance is at its lowest in a decade. It fell in 1991 to $646 million from $751 million in 1990 and $1.3 billion in 1988. Generally, reserves of many of Canada's metals have dropped significantly since the early 1980s. For instance proven and probable reserves of copper, nickel and zinc were almost two-thirds of those reported in 1981 while lead was down to 60 per cent of its 1981 level.

For the first time in recent history, mineral production is exceeding reserve additions and opportunities for mineral exploration and development continue to be squeezed. Mineral exploration is of course high risk and a high dollar is attached. It is very important that mineral exploration in Canada be returned to high levels to replace depleting reserves but this is only possible if sufficient incentives are provided to attract investment to the high risks of mineral exploration. Without steps toward rejuvenating the Canadian mineral industry it faces a future in which its position as a world class producer would be in jeopardy.

• (1225)

Mr. John E. Cole (York—Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I think you will find there is consent to do all stages of Bill C-107 including Committee of the Whole to complete consideration of this bill today.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): The hon. members have heard the terms of the motion. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Carried.

Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to say a few words about Bill C-107, an act to amend the Explosives Act.

The present Explosives Act has not been updated for almost 20 years and this bill modernizes the existing act. The main focus is on bringing investigatory and seizure powers into line with the charter and clarifying and modifying various provisions, including the definition of explosives. Let me concentrate initially on just one aspect of this bill as I think it presents a very real concern.

It is a fact that Bill C-107 does not contain WHMIS-style protection for workers handling explosives. The government has given assurances that such concerns will be addressed through the regulations of this bill. I would like to explain this point by backtracking a bit.

In June 1987 amendments to the Hazardous Products Act or HPA, were passed to establish the Workplace Hazardous Materials Information System or WHMIS as it is known in the work place.

WHMIS is a national system created to provide Canadian workers with information on the proper handling of hazardous materials in the work place with the purpose of reducing accidents, illness and injuries. WHMIS is founded on a consensus reached by industry, labour and the federal, provincial and territorial governments. WHMIS legislation came into force in October 1988.

As a condition of selling and importing hazardous work place material the Hazardous Products Act requires two conditions from suppliers. Suppliers must label containers and they must provide hazard information through detailed documents called material safety data sheets or MSDS.

At the same time complementary federal, provincial and territorial occupational safety and health legislation imposes similar requirements on employers. Employers are required to label hazardous materials used or stored in the work place. They have to make material safety data sheets available to workers and they are required to provide worker education programs.

The Hazardous Products Act contains a number of exclusions, one of which is explosives, thus explosives are not covered by WHMIS protection. These exclusions were required to be reviewed by a parliamentary committee, the Standing Committee on Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Government Operations with a report to be presented in April 1992.

Recommendations were developed on the basis of a need to continue the exclusions and whether the objectives of WHMIS were being met. When WHMIS was implemented it was felt that explosives could be excluded because workers were protected by other legislation such as the Explosives Act and its regulations, the Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act and its regulations, and provincial mining and labour acts dealing with safety.

This was endorsed by the groups making representations to the standing committee but they wanted to ensure that the explosives industry would comply. They could not reach consensus on whether this was best achieved by bringing explosives under the Hazardous Products Act or amending the regulations under the Explosives Act.

The explosives manufacturers felt that hazards posed by explosives were unique and best addressed outside of WHMIS. The continuation of the exclusion with amendments to the Explosives Act received support from the chief inspector of explosives who noted that specialized knowledge was required for the proper administration of safety legislation.

The Canadian Labour Congress recommended that a parallel hazard information system should not be created for explosives. Others such as the Ontario Ministry of Labour agreed saying that a single system under the Hazardous Products Act would simplify administration and enforcement.

There was disagreement however from some Canadian explosives manufacturers. These manufacturers recommended that WHMIS-type information for explosives be provided under the Explosives Act. Bringing explosives under WHMIS according to them could result in less prominence being given to important information and about the explosive characteristics of a product and the possible confusion of different types of hazard information.

Also these manufacturers felt that the explosives branch of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources that currently regulates explosives would be best to administer WHMIS-type provisions for explosives. The different sectors agreed that worker protection was needed for those handling explosives. It was how best to provide that protection where there was a disagreement.

The choices are to either remove explosives from the WHMIS exclusions, thus bringing it under the Hazardous Products Act, or amend the regulations of the Explosives Act, thus creating a separate system specifically for explosives.

• (1230)

Although consensus in the exclusion review process was not reached, the standing committee did make a number of recommendations for amending the explosives regulations. The committee felt that while a consistent national hazardous information system was preferable to a proliferation of parallel systems, the Explosives Act was the better vehicle for dealing with the unique characteristics of explosives.

Two strong points support this. One is that the explosives industry wishes to deal with a single regulatory body and the other is that a great deal of expertise is necessary to regulate explosives.

The recommendations of the standing committee are that WHMIS-type labelling and material safety data sheets be instituted for explosives; explosives continue to be excluded from the provisions of part II of the Hazardous Products Act and the recommendations of the sectoral committee on explosives be implemented under the Explosives Act and regulations.

The standing committee also dealt with another aspect. It was determined that there was potential for problems to arise if explosives were regulated as hazardous waste. According to the committee report the chief inspector of explosives felt that the regulation of explosives should be consistent throughout their life cycle. Hazards could occur if explosives were shipped as waste and therefore not subject to the safety measures identified in the Explosives Act and regulations. Thus the committee made a third recommendation that substances and articles that are explosives within the meaning of the Explosives Act not be classified as waste.

In a response dated May 12, 1993 to the standing committee's report, the government agreed to implement the latter two recommendations with assistance from a tripartite working group made up of representatives from industry, labour and occupational health and safety regulators. However on the first recommendation that WHMIS-type labelling and material safety data sheets be instituted for explosives, the government response states: "Only the intent of WHMIS and not the existing formats can be adopted".

I believe this intent must be reflected and strengthened in the regulations to Bill C-107. I hope that as we enter into the clause by clause review in Committee of the Whole the government will be able to respond positively to this request.

Those are my comments at the moment. I may have something more to add once we get to third reading later today.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and by unanimous consent, the House went into committee thereon, Mr. DeBlois in the chair.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: House is in Committee of the Whole on Bill C-107, an act to amend the Explosives Act.

Clauses 1 to 14 inclusive agreed to.

• (1235)

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Shall the title carry?

Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan): Mr. Chairman, on the title, I wonder if I can put a question to the minister with regard to the request from the standing committee which recommended that WHMIS-type labelling and material safety data sheets be instituted for explosives. The government's response which was dated May 12 was that only the intent of WHMIS and not the existing formats can be adopted.

I wonder if the minister can explain to the House why it is not possible to take an already existing mechanism, for example the forms that are provided under WHMIS, and through regulations adopt them for explosives handling for those workers who are exposed to it.

If the minister is not in a position himself to provide that technical answer I wonder if he would undertake to review the specific request of the standing committee and, as it is drafting the regulations, see if there is a way an existing form which is known and used well by people can be adopted rather than trying to reinvent the wheel so to speak to accommodate an existing act.

I wonder if the minister could give consideration to accepting the recommendation of the standing committee's report that asked that WHMIS-type labelling and material safety data sheets be instituted for explosives. As I remind the minister, it was only the intent that was accepted.

Hon. Doug Lewis (Solicitor General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, in my previous incarnation as Minister of Transport I had some dealings with the issue of packaging and transportation of dangerous goods.

My hon. friend makes an eminently sensible comment when he suggests that I undertake to ask that any regulations be written with the view of using existing, well understood forms and I would presume wording. Since the issue is really the safety of people, whether they are workers on the job or workers trying to clean up an accident, I have no difficulty whatsoever in giving the undertaking of the government to keep the intent issue in mind when regulations are being drafted.

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, since the acting minister is the Solicitor General as well, I wonder if this legislation would have been beneficial in preventing the kind of action that occurred in Giant Yellowknife where a number of lives were lost. I wonder whether the strengthening of the Explosives Act would be beneficial in preventing that kind of incident again since he obviously would be aware of the investigation and details of that tragic event.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, in my present incarnation as Solicitor General I am not in a position to make any comment on whether or not these changes would have had any effect on the incident in Yellowknife mines.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Doug Lewis (for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources) moved that the bill be concurred in at the report stage.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): When shall the bill be read the third time? With unanimous consent, now?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Lewis (for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources) moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.

Mr. Langlois: Mr. Speaker, the House was so efficient this morning that we have more or less finished consideration of all bills on the Order Paper. I therefore suggest we call it one o'clock. I also wish to give notice to the House that after Question Period, at three o'clock, we will call Bill C-128, on child pornography.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

SITTING SUSPENDED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): The sitting of the House is therefore suspended until two o'clock this afternoon.

At 12.41 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 31

[*Translation*]

THE HELP WANTED INDEX

Mr. Guy Saint-Julien (Abitibi): Madam Speaker, according to Statistics Canada, the help wanted index is one indication of economic recovery. The index went up eight points in May, and StatsCan said yesterday that at 95, it was the index's best performance since it dropped to 85, which was 15 months ago.

A significant sign of future labour demand, the index measures changes in the number of help wanted ads published in 20 of our major urban centres. The help wanted index has gone up 9 per cent in Quebec, and the figures show a 17 per cent increase in Quebec between May 1992 and May 1993.

* * *

[*English*]

CANADIAN CROSSROADS INTERNATIONAL

Mr. Francis G. LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso): Madam Speaker, today we are pleased to welcome in the House of Commons a delegation of international representatives from more than 25 countries here to participate with Canadian volunteers in Canadian Crossroads International's 1993 international consultation.

These representatives and their counterparts across Canada are part of a dynamic organization which is giving a uniquely Canadian expression to the pursuit of a goal which we all share, that of greater understanding, harmony and equality among the world's peoples and cultures.

[*Translation*]

Every year, Canadian Crossroads International sends some 300 participants to 30 countries, to work on education, health care and community development projects. The experience is unforgettable and is often the beginning of what may become a lifetime commitment.

[*English*]

As a former crossroader to Zambia in 1975 I share membership in this special family with our colleague, the leader of the New Democratic Party, more than 3,500 Canadians and more than 1,000 citizens from developing countries around the world.

Since 1970 Crossroads has received more than $18 million from the Canadian government for which the volunteers expressed their gratitude this week.

This public support combined with private sector donations—

Madam Deputy Speaker: Unfortunately I must interrupt the hon. member as the member's time has expired.

* * *

[*Translation*]

THE AUDIOTHÈQUE

Mr. Marcel R. Tremblay (Québec-Est): Madam Speaker, I would like to wish the team at the Audiothèque du Québec a happy 10th birthday. In 1983, this project was designed, created and developed by Pierre Schram and Sylvie Ouellet, who are visually impaired, as a Canada community development project. The main objective was to provide an audio information service for the visually impaired.

Ten years later, the Audiothèque has maintained that focus by providing access to information found in newspapers, magazines and folders; by helping the visually impaired with their correspondence, and by showing them how to use existing services and where to find these resources.

The type of services now offered by the Audiothèque is very diverse and covers all aspects of human activity. I say three cheers for the Audiothèque team and its many volunteers who are living proof that the volunteer spirit consists in helping others and enhancing the well-being of those around us.

* * *

[*English*]

PENDER ISLAND

Ms. Lynn Hunter (Saanich—Gulf Islands): Madam Speaker, I would like to tell you a David and Goliath story. David is the Pender Island residents who did not want a communications tower erected on their beautiful island. Goliath is Rogers Cantel, which went against the wishes of local residents and local government, received a building permit through dubious circumstances and erected its tower. Now the decision rests with Communications Canada. Will the tower stay or go?

The department has asked the parties to resolve their differences within 60 days before a final decision is made. In the meantime, Cantel is using the tower because it has already had assurances from the federal government that the tower will be staying.

It has no incentive to bargain with the local folks. After all, it knows the Conservative government, in true Tory fashion, is already secretly on its side.

I raised this matter in the House only two days ago, urging the minister to prevent Goliath from stamping all over tiny David.

Unfortunately the minister chose to slip away and issued a temporary licence, content that the profits of a corporation would, as usual, triumph—

Madam Deputy Speaker: I am sorry but the hon. member's time has expired.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Mr. Stan Wilbee (Delta): Madam Speaker, Canadians have endured a great deal of change over the last while but, as the latest economic reports show, we are beginning to reap our just rewards.

Both the OECD and the IMF have forecast that Canada will lead the G-7 in growth both in 1993 and 1994. As well, both organizations show that Canada's inflation rate of 1.8 per cent is one of the lowest among all of the industrialized nations.

Other signs of improvement include the GDP, which rose in the first quarter of 1993 by an amazing annual rate of 4 per cent, and job creation, as 69,000 new jobs were created in the same first quarter.

• (1405)

The job creation is almost solely the result of the free trade agreement, which in 1992 saw exports to the U.S. reach a record high level of $122.3 billion. That is $19.6 billion more than it was in 1988.

The facts are clear. New jobs are being created and the economy is on the rise. Canada is well on its way to new prosperity—

Madam Deputy Speaker: The hon. member's time has expired.

* * *

SAFE GRAD

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, high school graduations are upon us.

Graduating parties will be taking place throughout the month. Students could choose to have an alcohol and drug-free party, and that is an option I hope they would consider. However they could also consider another option, the Safe Grad program.

Safe Grad combines students' graduation celebrations with realistic measures to prevent accidents and other problems associated with drinking and driving. It is a student-run program that is geared toward the needs and wishes of individual schools.

The aim of the program is to enable graduates to have their graduation parties but to ensure that others look after transportation afterwards.

I am most impressed with the actions of the students of Manitoba and their support for Safe Grad and would like to take this opportunity to commend their actions.

I recommend it as an option to all Canadian students. I would like to take this opportunity on behalf of all members to wish all graduates a safe and happy graduation.

* * *

VIOLENT OFFENDERS

Mrs. Edna Anderson (Simcoe Centre): Madam Speaker, this past week the government introduced a new law to protect the public from dangerous offenders. This initiative is in response to the clear consensus among Canadians that the government must have the power to keep violent offenders in custody as long as their release poses a serious threat to society.

This legislation makes it possible for the courts to detain dangerous high-risk offenders beyond their original sentences and prevent them from committing more violent acts against innocent Canadians, especially women and children.

* * *

FINANCE

Hon. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton—Melville): Madam Speaker, over the past two days the hearings of the finance committee have been very interesting.

Two days ago the deputy minister of finance, David Dodge, stated that in retrospect the Bank of Canada made some mistakes with its high interest rate, inflation fighting policy. It began too late and went on for too long.

Yesterday, when confronted with this evidence, the Governor of the Bank of Canada, John Crow, disagreed with David Dodge, the deputy minister of finance. He said that he would have to have a talk with Mr. Dodge.

It is very unique to have the deputy minister of finance saying something different from the Governor of the Bank of Canada. Whose side is the government on? Who speaks for the Government of Canada? Is it the Governor of the Bank of Canada, John Crow, or the deputy minister of finance, David Dodge?

The time has come for the government to resign and call an election so that we can have new ideas and a new government that will put the people of this country back to work.

* * *

INDIA

Mrs. Beryl Gaffney (Nepean): Madam Speaker, today is the ninth anniversary of the military attack on the Darbar Sahib, the Golden Temple.

All people abhor the ongoing communal violence from which thousands of men, women and children have been killed. Canada should encourage the UN Secretary General to take an active role in the creation of a lasting peace in India and in the Punjab.

The Canadian government should fulfil its stated commitment to link aid to a recipient country's record on human rights. It is imperative that we seek non-violent solutions to these problem areas.

When we are speaking about incidents at home or abroad Canadians should be sending the message that non-violent solutions must be found. The use of violence to achieve political ends is totally unacceptable.

We must continue to encourage the Indian government and all sides involved in the conflict to explore avenues to bring about a peaceful resolution to the ongoing violence.

* * *

THE GREAT LAKES

Hon. Alan Redway (Don Valley East): Madam Speaker, considering that 25 per cent of all Canadians draw their water from the Great Lakes it is shocking to learn from a new study that in 1990 American manufacturing plants pumped more than 680 million pounds of toxic chemicals into the Great Lakes. That was down from 750 million pounds in 1989 because of lower production brought on by the recession.

The three worst offenders in the eight states bordering the Great Lakes were the 3M Corporation in Minnesota, GE Plastics in Indiana and Eastman Kodak in Rochester, New York.

Occidental Chemical Corporation of Niagara Falls, New York, infamous for its association with the Love Canal, the Hyde Park chemical dump, the S Area dump and the 102nd Street dump, was not far behind.

Is it any wonder we are having trouble cleaning up the Great Lakes?

* * *

• (1410)

CAMBODIA

Mr. Jesse Flis (Parkdale—High Park): Madam Speaker, in spite of violence and intimidation the people of Cambodia turned out by the millions last week to participate in that country's national elections.

These were the first free and fair elections in 14 years of civil war in Cambodia. Despite the threat of disruption by the Khmer Rouge this event paves the way for a new constitution through elected government.

The hon. member for Brandon—Souris and I were both proud to serve as electoral observers of UNTAC, the United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia, but we were not the only ones from Canada participating in this tremendous international effort. Over 330 Canadians served as UN civilian volunteers, peacekeepers, or as electoral officials supplied by Elections Canada.

In view of the fact that eight UN officials were killed and another 32 were wounded before the election commenced I call upon this House to salute the bravery of all the Canadian women and men who put their lives on the line in the name of humanity and democracy.

* * *

NATIONAL ACCESS AWARENESS WEEK

Mrs. Louise Feltham (Wild Rose): Madam Speaker, May 31 marked the beginning of National Access Awareness Week, a time to focus on the concerns and aspirations of persons with disabilities.

National Access Awareness Week is a partnership, involving the government, disabled communities, voluntary organizations, business and corporate sponsors, committed to removing barriers for the 4.2 million Canadians with disabilities.

National Access Awareness Week encourages communities to evaluate their levels of accessibility in the areas of transportation, housing, employment, recreation and education, to foster greater public awareness of existing barriers and to take action to dismantle them.

As we observe this special week I invite all hon. members to renew their commitment to a Canada in which persons with disabilities are full and equal social partners.

* * *

FORESTRY

Mr. Brian L. Gardiner (Prince George—Bulkley Valley): Madam Speaker, it takes a lot of work to change old ways but it would seem that the B.C. government is doing that with new forestry legislation.

The government is introducing a new forest practices code and is building into its plans for the Clayoquot area reduced clear cuts, public input into planning, a model forest and a UNESCO biosphere reserve.

It is appropriate to raise this matter today given the tabling of the forestry minister's annual report to Parliament. Regrettably, at the same time the federal government, by giving notice of its intentions to allow forest agreements to expire, is taking a step backward in the role it can play in the sustainable development of our forests.

We are all making an effort to better manage our forests and we ask the federal government to rethink its plans for scrapping the FRDAs and to work toward better forest management with all participants in our forest community.

* * *

SAINT JOHN RIVER SOCIETY

Mr. J.W. Bud Bird (Fredericton—York—Sunbury): Madam Speaker, the Saint John River has frequently been called the Rhine of America. It flows through hundreds of miles of countryside in New Brunswick, Quebec, and Maine. It binds tens of thousands of citizens together in a state of international and intercultural friendship.

I want to recognize the formation of the Saint John River Society which will celebrate the existence of this wonderful resource and foster appreciation of its history and its potential.

The inauguration of this society will be marked on June 24, 389 years after the naming of the river by Samuel de Champlain and Sieur Demonts.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Mr. Girve Fretz (Erie): Madam Speaker, I would like to read the following headlines: "Factory output climbs—Canada leads industrial nations", "Canada bucks global economic trend", "Canadian economic growth hits two-year high", and "Canada poised to top G-7 growth".

It is no coincidence that the nine years preceding these newspaper headlines contained the tough choices and the real commitment to long-term economic prosperity which today are so popularly criticized.

What evidence exists to persuade Canadians that our economic strategy is on the right track? As we proceed from a cyclical economic downturn which is global in scope, growth in Canada's manufacturing output is stronger than that of any other major industrialized nation. At 4 per cent Canada's GDP growth has been steadily rising since January 1991, and in the first quarter of 1993 it was four times higher than that in the United States.

With the prediction that the Canadian economy will grow faster than that of any other major industrialized nation the OECD said yesterday that recovery in Canada—

Madam Deputy Speaker: I regret the member's time has expired.

* * *

• (1415)

STUDENT EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre): Madam Speaker, it is graduation time again. Across Canada thousands and thousands of students will graduate this year.

Many of those students will graduate with a debt load of approximately $15,000 to $20,000. The job market that existed 30 or 40 years ago is no longer there. Graduating from high school or university is no longer the happy occasion it used to be for family members, including the grandparents.

Take for instance what this government has done over the past few years. Last year it increased by $3 million the funds for the Summer Employment and Experience Development program. That was a drop in the bucket for a student unemployment rate at 18 per cent and more.

This year the government has only added $5 million which leaves the funding for the program at approximately $88 million. That is away below the 1985 figures.

Madam Deputy Speaker: I am sorry, the hon. member's time has expired.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

NORTH AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Hon. Roy MacLaren (Etobicoke North): Madam Speaker, the United States administration has stated that NAFTA will not be implemented without environmental and labour side agreements enforced by trade sanctions.

However yesterday after his meeting with President Clinton, the Prime Minister stated that trade sanctions are "totally unacceptable to Canada". The logic of this position is that Canada will either have to accept U.S. demands or refuse to proclaim NAFTA.

My question for the Prime Minister is this. Is the government prepared to walk away from NAFTA over the trade sanctions issue? Yes or no?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, what I indicated yesterday in Washington is that we would not accept amendments to the North American free trade agreement that impinged upon the sovereignty of Canada. If my hon. friend is suggesting something otherwise on behalf of the Liberal Party, then he ought to tell the House of Commons if that is his position.

I indicated we would not accept this and that I could not understand the logic of anybody proposing that trade sanctions be used with a view to destroying a dispute settlement mechanism which is the *causa causans* of the trade agreement in the first place. That being said, I expressed the hope and the belief that this could be worked out by way of negotiations and that appears to be the case.

President Clinton indicated to me yesterday and to the media that he fully expected that NAFTA would pass the American Congress.

Hon. Roy MacLaren (Etobicoke North): Madam Speaker, I would be happy to answer the Prime Minister's questions on another occasion. Today of course we are asking the Prime Minister to explain to the Canadian people what the policy of Canada is.

The Prime Minister must be aware that in the NAFTA negotiations a year ago Canada proposed an investment chapter which would have made any infringement subject to binding resolution. In other words, Canada itself proposed trade sanctions, an idea which the Bush administration subsequently rejected.

Why has the government reversed its position on sanctions? Why did Canada promote the idea of sanctions last year only to state that they are unacceptable today?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): My hon. friend is of course inadvertently distorting the position of the government. That happens so infrequently with him that I will not ask him to withdraw.

I do not know why he is so concerned about the well-being of the United States in regard to this. It seems to be quite able to look after itself—

Mr. Crawford: More so.

Mr. Mulroney: My hon. friend says more so. Then he will be pleased to hear that Mickey Kantor, the United States trade representative, a few hours ago in Paris said that there was reason for optimism about resolving the sanctions dispute. "We are making progress", he told American reporters at a private luncheon. "We have narrowed our differences on this point".

The hon. member can stop worrying about the Americans, his friends. They are saying things are okay.

Hon. Roy MacLaren (Etobicoke North): Madam Speaker, it is not a question of the Prime Minister answering for the United States. The question we are posing to the Prime Minister is: What is the Canadian position?

• (1420)

Basically the government's position has been that nothing in the side accords impinges or influences the treaty itself. That is why the government railroaded NAFTA through the House of Commons. It pushed it through the House of Commons without adequate discussion by the Canadian people.

The government knows that only last month the United States said that NAFTA would be modified and interpreted by the environmental and labour side accords which are not yet negotiated.

Does the Prime Minister not recognize that this confirms that NAFTA itself will be changed by the negotiation of the two side accords? In those circumstances, why did he push NAFTA through the House of Commons?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, I pushed NAFTA through the House of Commons because the House of Commons wanted to pass the legislation.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Mulroney: I walked into the House one day and the House rose up at once and said: "We want to pass NAFTA". So we went ahead and passed NAFTA.

Yesterday President Clinton said on NAFTA: "I think we can pass it with a very concerted effort, if the Congress has some assurances on the environmental and labour issues". We are ready to provide assurances on the environmental and labour issues. We are not ready to provide assurances that could be construed as an impingement on the sovereignty of Canada. We will not surrender the sovereignty of Canada. This government never has and never will.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Paul Martin (LaSalle—Émard): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. It is increasingly obvious that Canada was short-changed in the free trade agreement with the United States. There is plenty of evidence. Last week, it was durum wheat. This week, it's steel. Now that we know that the Americans are manipulating the trade rules to a shocking degree and that the Mexicans will be even more opportunistic, why does the government not first negotiate the same rules for all three partners before adopting NAFTA?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, the hon. member from Montreal says that Canada was short-changed in the negotiations with Mexico and the United States. That should come as a real surprise to the U.S. Congress. It is reluctant to endorse and sign the free trade agreement, and so are Ross Perot and the U.S. labour unions. They are saying publicly in the United States that Canada was so clever it obtained practically everything it wanted in these negotiations, and so did Mexico. We say that we got results that were good for us and for all three parties. So my friend should know that in the United States, the Americans are being accused of giving in too much to the Canadians and the Mexicans, which should be music to the ears of the hon. member for LaSalle—Émard.

[*English*]

Mr. Paul Martin (LaSalle—Émard): Madam Speaker, Mr. Perot was talking about Mexico, but I can understand how this Prime Minister might get the countries mixed up.

If you look at durum wheat or Canadian steel, the fact is that the Americans are running roughshod over this government.

In yesterday's decision on wire rod, for example, the Americans nailed Canada to the wall. But then miracle of miracles, they exempted Trinidad because that country was part of the Caribbean basin initiative.

This Prime Minister says he knows how to negotiate. Why was it that even Trinidad in the CBI was able to negotiate a better deal for its steel mills than was mighty Canada in the free trade agreement?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Now he is picking on Trinidad. I tell you, Madam Speaker, with these Liberals, nobody is safe.

Since the free trade agreement, Canadian exports to the United States have increased by approximately 25 per cent. Our job creation is up as a result of many billions of dollars of new exports to the United States.

• (1425)

Mr. Martin: Steel mills in Trinidad, Brian. That is the question.

Mr. Mulroney: The fact of the matter is that most countries would give their eye teeth to have a dispute settlement mechanism such as the one we have with the United States of America.

It has served us extremely well. Canada has won more disputes under the independent dispute settlement mechanism than the United States has. It has been extremely advantageous to us. It gives Canada an instrument no one else has.

My hon. friend has some background in business. He knows full well how advantageous the free trade agreement is. He knows how advantageous the North American free trade agreement is.

Although it would not happen in my lifetime, if ever the Liberals formed a government, long after I am gone to the great beyond, decades and decades from now, even the Liberals would rise up and support the free trade agreement and NAFTA.

* * *

POVERTY

Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing): Madam Speaker, last week the United Nations released its third report in as many months criticizing this government's social policies. That report harshly criticized the government for making no measurable progress on alleviating poverty or the severity of poverty.

My question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. He will know that social groups and the poor themselves have been saying the same thing. Now even the government's own advisory board, the National Council of Welfare, has concluded in its report that: "Clearly the federal government has contributed to the financial plight of welfare recipients".

Poverty is on the rise. The National Council of Welfare, the government's own advisory board, has said that the government is part of the problem.

When will this government change its social and economic policies? When will it become part of the solution, rather than part of problem?

Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Madam Speaker, I could quarrel with the results of those two reports but I will not. I will say that there is no member in this House who is not concerned about poverty in Canada. It is one of the reasons that last year this government spent so much money on initiatives relating to children.

In the last budget we did not cut transfers to individuals who had those particular problems. However, Canada, like all industrialized countries, has faced a recession and has faced tough times in terms of jobs and so on.

As I believe we are now coming into a new reality, we will continue to improve on what we have done. Once again, as other countries have done, Canada must face reality.

Even though I have great respect for the UN report, I believe that it does not refer particularly to what has been done in Canada since 1991.

Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing): Madam Speaker, it is not just the UN. The government's own advisory board has told the government that it is part of the problem and not part of the solution. Surely it is time the government listened to its own advisors.

The National Council of Welfare also said something we all know as well, that social assistance rates across Canada are far below the poverty line. I do not have to remind the minister that the Canada Assistance Plan Act requires social assistance rates to be adequate to ensure the basic requirements of food, shelter, clothing, fuel and so on.

Given the clear statement in the act, when will the government take the necessary steps to ensure that the basic needs of 2.8 million Canadians, men, women and children are met? When will the government act to reduce poverty rather than create poverty?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Madam Speaker, I will repeat what I said earlier in English. The Government of Canada has introduced a number of measures to try and deal with the problem of poverty in this country, which has increased—I agree with the hon. member—while bearing in mind our current economic constraints.

As for the report by the National Council of Welfare, I think the hon. member should explain that the Council stresses a number of facts that relate directly to the responsibility of the provinces. It is not up to the federal government to do the provinces' job, although the federal government has continued to transfer increasing amounts for social assistance.

Last year, for instance, over $7.3 billion was transferred, and these amounts are increasing steadily, but, I repeat, always in proportion to our current ability to meet these obligations, considering our budgetary constraints.

• (1430)

[*English*]

Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing): Madam Speaker, I am glad the minister finally recognizes that poverty is on the increase in Canada. It is about time this government recognized that.

If I can relate a slightly different question. The minister will know about the controversy of poverty lines being generated by his colleague, the chair of the subcommittee on poverty. She wants to redefine poverty rather than do anything to fix it.

The National Council of Welfare has said: "It regards the Statistics Canada low income cut-offs as poverty lines". Will the minister take this opportunity to publicly indicate that he accepts the view of the National Council of Welfare and repudiates the view of the member for Don Valley North?

Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Madam Speaker, first, if the member had been in the House he would know that many times I have said that poverty is a problem for this government. It is not the first time I have said that.

Second, I do not want to deal with a report which has not yet been tabled by the committee. When the report is received, we will deal with it.

In the meantime I believe that we have to do the best we can with regard to poverty in Canada. We have done and will continue to do that in regard to that capacity that we have to do something.

* * *

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

On two occasions in the last week the government has denied any wrongdoing in the decision by the Minister of the Environment to provide $200,000 in untendered contracts to Mr. David Small, the minister's current leadership campaign manager.

In addition to Mr. Small, I now have information that at least five other contract employees in the Department of the Environment's green plan operations group were involved in organizing a leadership campaign prior to the leadership being called and while these five additional employees were still on the public payroll.

What action is the Prime Minister prepared to take to investigate this improper use of taxpayer dollars to subsidize a Tory leadership campaign?

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, the hon. member is usually casting aspersions and slurs without having the facts.

Individuals who work for the government on contract or otherwise on their own time, after hours when they are not working, are free to do whatever they want. They can get involved in campaign activities on behalf of Conservatives, Liberals or NDPers. There is no restriction on that.

It is quite improper for the hon. member to slur these admittedly unnamed individuals at this point and to suggest there is something morally wrong with them getting involved in politics in their own free time.

Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte): Madam Speaker, the minister would be interested in knowing that in addition to Mr. Small, the campaign manager who received the $200,000 contract, Mr. Tim Ralfe, the director of communications for the Minister of the Environment's campaign, was also on contract. Mr. Mitch Patten, the director of delegate tracking, was also on a contract and three others I will not name here and now.

I want to say to the minister it is very clear that an entire campaign organization was being run out of the Jules Léger building on the 14th floor in Hull in advance of the leadership campaign and the minister knows that is an improper use of taxpayer funds.

What action is the minister prepared to take to ensure that the taxpayers see recovered funds improperly spent without their consent or permission?

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, the hon. member is totally false in his accusation. I would ask him to read this week's *Maclean's* magazine. He will see that when the Minister of the Environment got on a bus to go to Sherbrooke he still had not made up his mind whether he was going to announce his candidacy.

The moment he announced his candidacy neither Mr. Ralfe nor Mr. Small had received any remuneration. I have looked into the other members. The hon. member is totally and absolutely false and irresponsible in his accusations.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. What we are talking about here is not what people do in their spare time. We are talking about people getting untendered contracts from this government against Treasury Board rules and then going on, if not at the same time, to work in the leadership campaign. That is the issue.

• (1435)

Will the Prime Minister, in the last few days that he is in office, for once stand on behalf of the people of Canada rather than on behalf of Tory leadership hopefuls?

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): What I would like to see in the last few days of this Parliament is the hon. member acting responsibly. He keeps making the totally false accusation that Treasury Board guidelines were violated. They were not.

He knows that Mr. Small's contract was in respect of the Rio summit and that as a result of the work he did there the post-summit activities were also contacted to him. He knows that in fact as soon as he assumed the position with Mr. Charest's campaign he ceased receiving any remuneration from the government. He also knows if he is being fair and honest, that Mr. Charest himself did not know until virtually hours before his own announcement.

To suggest that the guidelines were broken is a totally false accusation. To suggest there is something inappropriate here is to suggest there is something wrong with that hon. member's mind.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Madam Speaker, only a week ago today the Prime Minister made similar accusations against me. The person about whom he had to retract later on was forced to resign.

I want to ask the person who is answering questions now, the government House leader—

[*Translation*]

—is he denying today that the contracts were awarded to Mr. Small in violation of Treasury Board regulations? Is he telling us that awarding such contracts is a perfectly legitimate procedure in this government? Is he telling us that Treasury Board approves this kind of procedure? If so, I suggest he talk to his colleague two seats down!

[*English*]

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): I am saying again, as has been said in this House several times, that the accusation by the hon. member of violation of Treasury Board guidelines is false.

* * *

INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. Ray Funk (Prince Albert—Churchill River): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Last Friday the federal government unilaterally dumped responsibility for 10,000 treaty Indian people receiving social assistance from Indian Affairs on to the provincial welfare system in Saskatchewan.

This move is causing organizational chaos, all kinds of stress and anxiety for society's most vulnerable families, and amounts to a $25 million off-load on to the already beleaguered taxpayers of Saskatchewan.

Can the minister tell us today that he is reversing this utterly callous and irresponsible move?

Hon. Thomas Siddon (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Madam Speaker, the government has been trying to persuade the province of Saskatchewan for over two years to accept the realignment of constitutional responsibility for native social services programming off reserve on the following basis.

All provinces have a responsibility under the Constitution for health and social services to all Canadians living within their precincts. This has been upheld by the courts. Of reserve the province of Saskatchewan has responsibility for social services for aboriginal and non-aboriginal persons without discrimination, and we intend to use funding to enhance the programs on reserve to the equivalent level.

Mr. Ray Funk (Prince Albert—Churchill River): Just because the government has managed to off-load its fiduciary responsibility on to other provinces does not make it right in Saskatchewan, and especially not the way it was done here.

My supplementary is for the Prime Minister. In the last budget the government cut the budget for Indian economic development by 28 per cent. It eliminated the rural and native housing program for Métis people and off reserve Indians and it failed again to address the chronic housing shortage that has been well documented in our Indian communities.

Therefore I would like to ask the Prime Minister if it is the deliberate policy of this government to force Indian people out of their communities by denying them jobs and housing and then to shirk any responsibility for them at all in the communities that receive them? Is this his policy or does it just look that way?

Hon. Thomas Siddon (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Madam Speaker, in terms of the preamble to the question about off-loading, the federal government pays 50 cents of every dollar contributed to health and social services for all residents in Saskatchewan, notwithstanding the fact that it is a 100 per cent provincial responsibility.

In terms of the federal budget for aboriginal programs, it now exceeds $5 billion. There was a $350 million increase in the last budget. There is a $347 million allocation to economic development, and the International Labour Organization—interestingly enough—recently found that Canada is one of the few nations in the world that has made significant progress on behalf of native peoples.

* * *

• (1440)

BOSNIA

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre): Madam Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister will know that yesterday on both sides of the House there was an expression of how heartsick Canadians are about the continuing slaughter in the former Yugoslavia and in the lack of action by the world community to stop that.

Yesterday in Washington, after his meeting with the President, the Prime Minister was suggesting that the United States might be sending troops under a new UN resolution. There is a new UN resolution presently being looked at by the Security Council today and to be voted on tomorrow which proposes:

> That the UN would take necessary measures including the use of force to stop attacks against all civilians.

Is this the kind of UN resolution that the Prime Minister was referring to? Does Canada support this resolution? Are we prepared to see the mandate of our own troops in Bosnia be changed in order to be able to protect civilians as this resolution suggests?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, yes, we support the resolution which is presently being debated before the Security Council because, along with my hon. friend, I think most Canadians are dissatisfied and dispirited with the lack of progress in bringing to a halt this murderous civil war in the Balkans.

That being said, I just point out to my hon. friend that I did not indicate yesterday that this resolution would be required for the United States to dispatch troops. They are quite capable of dispatching troops themselves without a United Nations resolution. They might choose to do so for example in Macedonia. That signal itself might be deemed to be positive.

Clearly the ultimate resolution of this must come through a new resolution from the Security Council of the United Nations particularly in regard to countries such as Canada which has already deployed thousands of peacekeepers on the terrain in the former Yugoslavia.

We are supportive of what is going on at the United Nations. The Secretary of State for External Affiars and I continue to work very closely with our ambassador, Madame Frechette, at the United Nations to see if we can be helpful in this process.

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre): Madam Speaker, with Canada's support of this resolution and looking at its potential or the fact that it will be voted upon tomorrow, considering that there is only a week left in this Parliament before we close for the Conservative convention, can we get an undertaking from the Prime Minister that the government will bring into the House a clear resolution that will mandate a change in the responsibilities and rules of engagement of any Canadian forces to fit this new resolution?

Does the Prime Minister agree that it would be very important that before we authorized Canadian UN peacekeeping troops to use force that it be approved by the Canadian people through their Parliament?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, many of the important points contained in the Security Council resolution today my hon. friend will find in a speech that I made in London a number of weeks ago in regard not only to the Security Council action, but the role of the Government of Canada and the Parliament of Canada might play in this.

We have some 2,500 peacekeepers on the ground now. Their protection and their safety is the prime concern of the Government of Canada. If there is going to be a change in their assignment or if the United Nations or any member thereof is going to undertake unilateral action that could compromise the well-being of those Canadians and other peacekeepers, we obviously want this to go to the Security Council for a new resolution.

The only manner in which there can be a change in our position is if it is blessed by the Security Council of the United Nations.

My hon. friend's position is not unreasonable. If we have the opportunity and if it moves along, I would be happy to consult both him and all members of the House in regard to any changes because the well-being of our troops there plus the effectiveness of Canada's contribution is always enhanced with the benefit of parliamentary consultation and debate.

* * *

FINANCE

Mrs. Diane Marleau (Sudbury): Madam Speaker, in this country, the Minister of Finance, under the leadership of the Prime Minister, is ultimately responsible for monetary policy.

• (1445)

In the form of a deathbed repentance the top bureaucrat of the Department of Finance has admitted that the Bank of Canada's high interest rate policy started too late and lasted too long, in effect exacerbating our debt and deficit positions.

Why did the Prime Minister stand by and allow so much damage? Is he prepared to demand a more balanced approach?

Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Finance and Privatization)): Madam Speaker, I find the comments coming from my hon. friend rather interesting. She says that the government dictates the monetary policy of the Bank of Canada when she knows full well that does not happen.

The Bank of Canada runs the affairs of the country through financial matters and the market dictates levels of interest rates. We agree with the Bank of Canada in getting interest rates and inflation down. They did that.

Governor Crow and the deputy minister of finance are having an interesting debate right now. I guess hindsight is 20/20. Anybody can go back and say they should have done this or they should have done that. That is an honest discussion on what has gone on in the past. However we believe and the governor believes the actions he took were the right ones.

I think we are finding that the results were right. The reports coming out of the OECD today indicate that we are poised for the best job creation, the best growth over the next two years, the lowest inflation and the lowest interest rates, all good signs for the economy. One of these days the Liberals are going to wake up and say that was the right thing to do.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Diane Marleau (Sudbury): Madam Speaker, my supplementary is directed to the same minister. Does the minister share the opinion of the deputy minister of finance that our monetary policy was too rigid and lasted too long? If so, will he ask for a more flexible monetary policy, because then it is easier to make changes once the results are in? Yes, or no?

[*English*]

Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Finance and Privatization)): Madam Speaker, I think the hon. member is interpreting the words of the deputy minister rather loosely, if I can put it that way.

What has gone on in the past was a decision that we had to get inflation under control and that we had to get interest rates down in order for us to get through the recession and come out the other end on top. That is exactly what is happening.

We can question till the cows come home whether the move should have been done a month earlier or a month later, whether we should have stayed on a month longer or a month less. We can question that and the economists will have a field day with that over the next number of years. They will discuss it in economics classes throughout Canada and probably the world.

The fact is that we are coming out of the recession in the best shape of any country in the G–7.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. McDermid: We are going to have the best job creation of all the countries of the OECD and we are going to have the best growth over the next couple of years. That is what is important to Canadians. One of these days the Liberals will wake up and realize that.

* * *

KEMANO PROJECT

Mr. Brian L. Gardiner (Prince George—Bulkley Valley): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice.

After a year's deliberation the Standing Joint Committee on the Scrutiny of Regulations has ruled in a report tabled in the House this morning that cabinet acted illegally in exempting the controversial Kemano water diversion project from an environmental review.

This is part of a growing mountain of evidence that the government has acted improperly in this case. It is a growing scandal of monumental proportions.

Will the minister accept this report and finally admit that their actions or lack thereof are threatening the future of the Nechako River in northern B.C.?

Hon. Pauline Browes (Minister of State (Employment and Immigration)): Madam Speaker, I wish to thank the committee members for the report tabled in the House today.

I understand the opinion expressed in that report differs from that administered by the Federal Court of Appeal which concluded the Kemano completion project guidelines were valid. We also understand this case went to the Supreme Court but it was not reviewed as the request to be heard was denied.

I want to assure the hon. member that the government will review the report and will report back to the House of Commons as a result of it being tabled in the House.

• (1450)

Mr. Brian L. Gardiner (Prince George—Bulkley Valley): Madam Speaker, my supplementary question is for the Minister of Justice who refused to answer a question the other day about a letter written by officials in his department threatening or warding off the B.C. Utilities Commission inquiry into this particular project in British Columbia.

Will the Minister of Justice remove this threatened gag order and finally release all the information on the project, join with the B.C. government, and conduct a full and proper review into the project?

Hon. Pauline Browes (Minister of State (Employment and Immigration)): Madam Speaker, the Kemano project has been under review within the court system for a number of years. The Federal Court of Appeal has made a decision on it. No other higher court has agreed to take this particular case.

We now have before the Parliament of Canada the report of the joint committee. The government will review that report and report back to the House.

* * *

[*Translation*]

LANGUAGE MINORITIES

Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister and concerns the funding, development and promotion of arts and culture for minority francophone communities.

We learned today that they receive only 50 cents from the federal government for arts and culture for every dollar other Canadian citizens receive on average. This is my question: What will he do to correct this serious injustice to French speaking Canadians living outside Quebec?

Hon. Gerry Weiner (Minister of Multiculturalism and Citizenship): I thank the hon. member for her question. The minister is unfortunately away today on government business. I know that she is a defender of the rights of official language minorities throughout the country and I am sure that she will answer the questions when she returns to the House.

Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal): Madam Speaker, the Prime Minister is supposed to protect minority languages and language rights throughout Canada. In this regard, I ask the Prime Minister this: When will he or his Minister of Communications recognize that there are francophone communities outside Quebec? When will he apply the spirit of the Official Languages Act which was passed in 1988? Does he personally promise to urge the Minister of Communications to meet the French Canadian Cultural Federation in the next seven days? They have been waiting for two years for a meeting with this Minister of Communications.

Hon. Gerry Weiner (Minister of Multiculturalism and Citizenship): As I said, I will raise the question with the Minister of Communications later today, and I am sure that he will answer the hon. member shortly.

* * *

[*English*]

EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Bob Speller (Haldimand—Norfolk): Madam Speaker, in the absence of any minister responsible for employment my question is for the Prime Minister.

The Prime Minister must be aware that Canada's youth are having an extremely hard time finding first-time jobs. In fact the number of young people who have never held a first-time job has gone up 53 per cent since 1989.

Why does the Minister of State for Youth not have in his department a specific program or a strategy to put these young people back to work?

Hon. Pauline Browes (Minister of State (Employment and Immigration)): Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to have an opportunity to respond to the question on behalf of the Minister of State for Youth and as the Minister of State for Employment and Immigration.

I think the hon. member has missed a lot in the last few years. We have put in place a stay-in-school project for young people to get information on getting skills and training. We have also put in place literacy programs, the sectoral councils and the apprenticeship programs working with the provinces. With the youth employment that has been put in place in terms of 179,000 jobs last year under the Challenge '92 program and the increase of $5 million for 1993 for youth employment, I think the record shows that we have done a great deal in terms of assistance for youth.

• (1455)

Mr. Bob Speller (Haldimand—Norfolk): Madam Speaker, that is why there is 20 per cent unemployment among Canadian youth. This department and this minister have no specific labour market programs.

My question is for the Prime Minister. Young Canadians have been hardest hit by this recession. In fact it accounts for 84 per cent of net job losses since 1989. What specific new programs or new ideas does the Prime Minister have to help this crisis and to put young Canadians back to work?

Hon. Pauline Browes (Minister of State (Employment and Immigration)): Madam Speaker, besides the Challenge '93 project which is some $88 million in terms of getting young people back to work and some 400 youth employment centres across Canada, we have put in place student business loans for young people to start businesses, the business drive for jobs in partnership with the Canadian Manufacturers' Association and federal hiring of students within our own government projects.

I am very pleased with the number of young people who have decided to start their own businesses. In North America we have the first youth centre, New Ventures, for young people to begin their own jobs. That is the kind of work that we are doing in terms of young people getting jobs by starting their own businesses.

* * *

[*Translation*]

MINING EXPLORATION

Mr. Guy Saint-Julien (Abitibi): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources.

To stimulate mining exploration in Quebec, especially in Abitibi, on May 10 I rose in the House twice during Question Period to send a message, loud and clear, so the minister would understand the current situation in the mining and exploration industry in Abitibi.

Could the deputy minister come to Abitibi for a one-day study session this month, to discuss the situation in the mining and exploration industry in that area with the Association des prospecteurs du Québec? Yes or no?

[*English*]

Hon. Bill McKnight (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Madam Speaker, the deputy or the minister would have to be deaf or absent not to recognize the interest my colleague has in the mining industry within his riding. I compliment him for that.

He would know, as others know, that Canada has one of the most favourable regimes for investment in the mining and exploration industry. As he also knows, the federal income tax rules allow for 100 per cent write-off for development and exploration. We have made that assistance available because we recognize, as he does, the importance of the mining industry.

We have also undertaken the Whitehorse mining initiative in co-operation with labour, the mining industry and our provincial partners to further encourage and further develop this important activity.

As my colleague knows, the deputy minister has indicated to me that he would be pleased to travel anywhere to meet members of the mining industry and particularly to the fine riding of Abitibi.

* * *

CANADIAN RADIO-TELEVISION AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. Ian Waddell (Port Moody—Coquitlam): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. I would like to welcome him back to the House. I saw him taking off in a White House helicopter; he looked just like George Bush.

In a very important ruling today the CRTC once again allowed cable companies to take more money out of the pockets of ordinary consumers to pay for Canadian programming.

Given that the cable companies make three times more profit than the broadcasting companies, and given that his government has power to direct the CRTC, will the government direct the CRTC to fully regulate the cable companies and take some of the programming money, the $300 million the CRTC wants, out of the fat pockets of the cable companies, not out of the slim pockets of the consumers?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, first may I say that the last words I heard when I left Washington came from George Bush and he said: "Give my affectionate respects to Ian Waddell".

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

• (1500)

Mr. Mulroney: I hope he is not watching this after what the member just said, and I know he watches regularly.

I thank my hon. friend for his views with regard to a CRTC decision. We will examine the decision very carefully and give his views the careful consideration we usually give them.

Mr. Waddell: I won some of it today, Brian.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT

Mr. Alfonso Gagliano (Saint-Léonard): Madam Speaker, since today is Thursday, could the government House leader give us an indication what the business of the House will be for the rest of this week and next week?

[*English*]

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, I think we have agreement this afternoon to do second reading of Bill C-128, Criminal Code amendments dealing with child pornography.

Tomorrow we hope to pass the two Nunavut bills which provide for the creation of the Nunavut territory and put into effect the Inuit land claims in that territory. After that we hope to complete Bill C-103, the Land Titles Act.

On Monday we will begin with Bill C-101, the Canada Labour Code, for third reading and Bill C-122, the Textile Tariffs Act, and Bill C-121, the Canada Shipping Act.

On Tuesday we would like to compete report stage of Bill C-62, the telecommunications act.

I will be in contact with House leaders with respect to the rest of the week, but in all likelihood Wednesday would follow with third reading of Bill C-62.

As for the other days of that week I would seek the support of the House for the courtesy of adjourning next Friday, a week tomorrow, as a result of the Progressive Conservative leadership convention and would ask that the House not sit that day.

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops): Madam Speaker, would the government House leader comment on the possibility of the Yukon land claims act being introduced before the Conservative convention a week Friday?

Mr. Andre: The drafting is ongoing with the active participation of native groups from Yukon. I understand it is literally a matter of days of defining some of the details and then agreeing to them.

I will be meeting later this day with officials from the Privy Council Office to see what progress has been made on that bill. I am still hopeful. I have certainly been putting what pressure I can on them to bring forward that bill before we adjourn for the summer. I cannot be more specific than that at this time.

Mr. McKnight: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to seek unanimous consent to table a report.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY PERMANENT ENGINEERING BOARD

REPORT TO GOVERNMENTS OF CANADA AND UNITED STATES

Hon. Bill McKnight (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to Standing Order 32(2) to table the report of the Columbia River Treaty Permanent Engineering Board to the Governments of the United States and Canada for the period October 1, 1991 to September 30, 1992.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURE TO AMEND

Hon. Gerry Weiner (for the Minister of Justice) moved that Bill C-128, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Customs Tariff (child pornography and corrupting morals), be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee in the Departmental envelope.

Mr. Rob Nicholson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister of State (Agriculture)): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in the House today to speak on Bill C-128. This bill amends the Criminal Code and the Customs Tariff to specifically prohibit child pornography. We are taking important steps to protect children from sexual abuse and exploitation.

The government is responding to the calls of the Canadian public to curb the flow of child pornography. I share that concern.

• (1505)

As I stated at the National Symposium on Community Safety and Crime Prevention held in Toronto in March, children matter. They are the most vulnerable members of our society. They are vulnerable to emotional, sexual and physical abuse. Our children must have the opportunity to grow up in safe, nurturing communities protected from such abuse.

The purpose of a law specifically addressing child pornography is to deal with the sexual exploitation of children and to make a statement regarding the inappropriate use and portrayal of children in media and art which have sexual aspects.

Our message is that children need to be protected from the harmful effects of child sexual abuse and exploitation and are not appropriate sexual partners.

By way of background, hon. members will recall that the Supreme Court of Canada upheld the definition of obscenity in the Criminal Code in its February 1992 decision in the Butler case.

In that decision the court was asked to determine the constitutional validity of the current definition of what is obscene as found in section 1638 of the Criminal Code. This definition is intended to deal with material where a dominant characteristic is the undue exploitation of sex, or sex combined with one or more of the subjects of crime, horror, cruelty and violence.

In the Butler judgment there is a clear statement from the Supreme Court that pornography which contains explicit sex and employs children in its production qualifies as the undue exploitation of sex. As such its production and distribution are prohibited by the provisions currently in the Criminal Code.

What the Criminal Code does not currently prohibit is the simple possession of child pornography, nor does it contain specific statutory prohibitions against such pornography.

Members of this House will recall that two special committee reports commissioned by the federal government, the Badgley report in 1984 and the Fraser report in the following year, recommended that there be amendments to the Criminal Code to specifically prohibit child pornography. It was also recommended that such amendments be limited to visual representations or depictions of explicit sexual conduct involving persons under the age of 18 years.

There was concern then and there is concern now with the especially compelling nature of visual materials in delivering a message.

More recently, in 1990 the special advisor on child abuse to the Minister of National Health and Welfare, Mr. Rix Rogers, recommended that legislation be introduced to address the protection of children from the harmful effects of pornography. This would include a revision of the Criminal Code with harsher penalties for using children in the production of sexually explicit material.

Bill C-128 introduces those specific amendments to the Criminal Code which address the problem of child pornography. The proposed legislation includes a definition of child pornography and new offences for the distribution, sale, production and possession of child pornography based on this definition.

As I have stated, the production and distribution of these forms of child pornography are currently prohibited but their possession is not.

While child pornography may not now be generally available on a commercial basis in Canada, we know that it is home-made by paedophiles who have communication networks and exchange clubs. These are persons who share an interest in sexual activity involving children and commonly exchange photographs they have taken of children who have been the objects of their abuse. These photographs and videos are palpable evidence of the sexual abuse of these children.

By making simple possession of child pornography an offence it is our intention to dissuade such activity. We have been urged to take this step by many, including law enforcement personnel who have seen the lack of an offence for the simple possession of such materials as a barrier to curbing the flow of child pornography.

• (1510)

In addition, by creating an offence for simple possession and introducing legal sanctions against the consumer, we attack any commercial market for these materials such as videos, magazines or computer programs which involve or depict children engaged in explicit sexual activity and reduce the incentive for their production.

The definition proposed refers to a photographic, film, video, or other visual representation whether or not it was made by electronic or mechanical means that shows a person who is or is depicted as being under the age of 18 years and is engaged in or is depicted as engaging in explicit sexual activity.

Hon. members will note that the proposed definition refers to a person who is or is depicted as being under the age of 18 years. We have chosen to include depiction of persons as being under the age of 18. That is because failing to include depictions would be seen as failing to address an issue of concern to many Canadians, that the children not perceived as appropriate objects of sexual interest including depictions in the definition serve to prohibit pseudo child pornography, that is where adult models are presented to appear as children which is more openly distributed than other forms of child pornography, but still nonetheless promotes the sexual abuse of children.

It is important to protect children who directly suffer the harms of sexual abuse and exploitation in the production of child pornography, but also others, by denouncing the message that child pornography conveys to the consumer of these materials: that children are somehow appropriate sexual partners.

In limiting the proposed definition of child pornography to visual representations, we have focused on those materials which most clearly require or motivate the sexual use and exploitation of children in order to protect them from child sexual abuse and related harms.

Written materials will continue to be dealt with under the current provisions of the Criminal Code, as upheld by the Supreme Court of Canada decision in R. *v.* Butler.

Offences have been created for the production, distribution and sale of child pornography which are subject to terms of imprisonment to a maximum of 10 years. In addition, the possession of child pornography is subject to a term of imprisonment not exceeding five years. These offences are hybrid. That is, they can be made on an indictable or a summary conviction offence, depending of course on the circumstances of each particular case.

The defence of artistic merit or an educational, scientific or medical purpose in Bill C-128 is not one which places a persuasive burden on the person charged with one of the child pornography offences. The availability of such a defence is important for ensuring that the reach of the legislation does not extend to forms of expression which the courts consider beneficial to society, such as health education.

It is essential to include this defence in the proposed legislation in order to protect the freedom of expression rights which are clearly entrenched in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. There may be materials which depict children under the age of 18 which may represent some artistic merit or for some other purpose and, as such, deserve the protection of the Criminal Code.

We have also introduced consequential amendments to the Criminal Code which would serve to include the child pornography offences in the definition of offence in part VI of the Criminal Code so that the electronic surveillance provisions will apply. In the definition of enterprise crime offence of the Criminal Code they will fall under the proceeds of crime provisions as well.

As a consequential amendment to the Customs Tariff Act the definition of child pornography will be incorporated in schedule VII to the tariff. This will provide customs officials with the necessary authority to ban the importation of these materials into Canada. This, of course, will be bad news for those individuals who would love to try to import this sort of material into the country. We have seen to it that they will continue to be blocked.

In summary, Bill C-128 will amend the Criminal Code to include a specific definition of child pornography and offences for the possession, production, distribution and sale of such materials as defined. It would subject those accused of these offences to greater penalties upon conviction than those currently associated with the obscenity sections of the Criminal Code.

• (1515)

We need to reinforce the message that children are in need of protection, that they are not appropriate sexual partners. Conduct which fosters and exploits the harm and humiliation to which children are exposed must be punished.

Bill C-128 supports the government's commitment to the well-being of children as outlined in the protection component of the Brighter Futures initiative which was announced by the Minister of National Health and Welfare in April of last year.

This bill is yet another step in ensuring a brighter future for all of Canada's children. I urge the members of this House to deal with this legislation expeditiously. If and when this becomes the law of Canada, and I believe it will, hon. members can take the satisfaction of going home this summer knowing that this country is a better place in which to live because we have criminalized the possession of child pornography.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Langlois: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The hon. parliamentary secretary on a point of order.

Mr. Langlois: Mr. Speaker, if there is any time left when we have completed second reading of Bill C-128 today, I would like to request the unanimous consent of the House to proceed with third reading of Bill C-123 later today.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Does the hon. member have unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. George S. Rideout (Moncton): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise on Bill C-128. I guess we could say that it is about time. There has been a flood of justice legislation over the last number of weeks. We are always faced with time constraints in trying to get legislation passed before Parliament is through for good and we are into an election.

We on this side are faced with the conundrum of not wanting to pass legislation in haste but at the same time wanting to do something that is good. We faced that dilemma with Bill C-126, the stalking bill. The committee met until last night at 10 o'clock to try to get a good bill before Parliament and finished before the session is over.

This is another example of a piece of good legislation that probably needs some fine-tuning by committee. I only hope the government will allow enough study of this particular bill while it is in committee. I hope it will not adopt the jackboot tactics it has used with other legislation, particularly Bill C-90, of trying to force legislation that needs to be studied through in a matter of hours or minutes.

That being said, we are supportive of this bill going to committee and receiving the necessary study. I do not think anyone would question that pornography has been with us almost since the beginning of history, from the time we learned how to draw.

We have seen the pornography industry grow from a $5 million industry in the seventies to a $10 billion business today. That is reprehensible when one considers that kind of money is generated from that kind of trade.

What is really even more reprehensible is the growth in child pornography. For that we say to the government: Good for you, that you are bringing this legislation forward. One thing that is a little irksome is that in the minister's own background documentation it says that the government has been urged to bring this legislation forward since 1984. Here we are in 1993, in the dying days of this Parliament, and now we are presented with the bill.

• (1520)

There are some complications in the legislation. This is not easy legislation with which to deal. Pornography is difficult to define and difficult to legislate so that it is not struck down once the courts start to have their effect.

I am sure we have all been through the number of different decisions and concerns. It was gratifying to see that the Butler decision of the Supreme Court of Canada opened the door to allow us to legislate in this area. It allowed legislation on all pornography which is degrading, dehumanizing and violent. I do not think there is anything more dehumanizing than child pornography.

I have some concerns as to whether the definition as contained in Bill C-128 goes far enough. I will read proposed subsection 163.1(1) of the Criminal Code into the record because I think it is important:

> 163.1(1) In this section, "child pornography" means a photographic, film, video or other visual representation, whether or not it was made by electronic or mechanical means, that shows a person who is or is depicted as being under the age of eighteen years and is engaged in or is depicted as engaged in explicit sexual activity.

That definition is very broad and leaves it open for an interpretation as to what constitutes explicit sexual activity and how far that would go.

I am looking forward to hearing some evidence from experts in the field as to how we could tighten up that definition and describe what we are prepared to allow and what we are not prepared to allow.

There are other sections in the legislation which are positive. The parliamentary secretary referred to it. This is going to be an interesting one because again in proposed subsection 163.1(4) it says that every person who possesses any child pornography is guilty of an offence, either an indictable offence or a summary conviction. It is going to be interesting to see how that is going to be applied. I think it is a good idea and I am hopeful that it can be effective. However it is a very broad ranging situation as to what constitutes possession and what type of offence will flow from that.

Again we see a very clear indication as to why the committee needs to spend the time and effort to come up with a good law. I know that in our deliberations on Bill C-126 dealing with the anti- stalking legislation the committee worked hard and made the changes that were necessary to make good law.

It seems that the opposition members are always stuck with the responsibility of trying to improve on what the government puts forward. They never really get it right the first time. I think there are some loose ends in this legislation that are going to require those types of efforts from opposition members.

It is a good piece of legislation in general. There is another excellent section on making child pornography an indictable offence as well with a penalty not to exceed 10 years. This again is an excellent idea. It shows that we take this thing seriously and that it is not a matter of a summary conviction or a small sentence of a year or two.

When we in Parliament indicate that 10 years is the maximum then we are signifying our concern with respect to child pornography. We are signifying our concern about all of pornography when we start on this basis.

We on this side of the House are pleased really for two reasons. First, it is here. I believe we will have enough time to get the legislation through. Second, it is another time in which the Conservative government has taken one of the Liberal planks and has tried to adopt it before we are the government.

A few weeks ago after I had introduced a private member's bill on anti-stalking, the government finally came forward with some legislation. We had announced our crime prevention platform. In it was included crime prevention and anti-stalking legislation. Lo and behold shortly thereafter the government came forward with this type of legislation.

• (1525)

We did the same thing with respect to child pornography that was a platform of the Liberal Party. Now this government has come forward with child pornography legislation.

I think that if we keep announcing our platform we will finally see some good legislation starting to come from this government but perhaps there is not enough time left.

In any event I know that I am sharing my time with my colleague from Dartmouth and for that reason I will simply say that we are supportive of this going to committee. We are supportive of giving the committee enough time to really study this legislation to finally get the legislation correct.

Mr. Ron MacDonald (Dartmouth): Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleagues from Moncton and Cape Breton—The Sydneys for the work that they have done in their critic portfolios, not just recently but over the last number of years, in dealing with issues such as this.

Surely one of the issues that must seize all parliamentarians and I guess all Canadians is the safety of our children. Clearly one of the things that constitutes an abuse or violation of the safety of our children is pornography.

The Liberal Party and my friends from Moncton and Cape Breton—The Sydneys have worked very hard and diligently on this particular issue over the last number of years. Indeed the Liberal Party policy position just a few weeks ago clearly indicated some of the things we felt should be done in the field of justice administration in order to try to rectify some of the abuses that currently are no longer acceptable and perhaps were never acceptable to Canadian society.

I also want to commend my colleague from Saskatoon. About a week ago he had a private member's motion before this place dealing with this exact subject matter. I said in my speech at that point in time that it was unfortunate that the partisan nature of this House does not allow for members to seek unanimity on issues even as important as this. It is an issue that I think all members of the House would agree has to be dealt with in an expeditious manner in this place.

Clearly one of the problems we have, as my colleague said, is that there has been a number of pieces of legislation which have been long overdue that were brought in by the government in the last five days that this Parliament sits.

It is very clear it is using these real issues, such as stalking, child pornography and a whole host of justice issues, to put pieces of legislation on the floor of the House in the dying days of the Parliament. It will probably not pass many—if any—of them and then it will run a law and order platform in the upcoming election campaign. If it does that then they should be condemned and damned for it.

We are talking about fundamental changes to protect our youth, our children, in this country. I do not know why these changes were not brought forward a long time ago.

We have heard from our critic, the member from Moncton, and we will hear from the New Democratic Party. There is a unanimity of opinion in this House that this issue has to be addressed. There is a unanimity of opinion in this House that a law dealing with stalking has to be addressed.

The difficulty is when the government opposite decides that it is much too busy doing other things and it is only going to try to showcase at the end of a Parliament some pieces of progressive legislation so they can run on it. It is truly despicable.

I hope that the government opposite is serious about pursuing this matter in a proper fashion and allowing the committee to hold quick but detailed hearings on it so that for once we can say that this Parliament has produced some legislation which has corrected some flaws in our laws and has protected the most vulnerable in our society and that is our children.

I think everybody would agree that people who exploit children for a sexual purpose and for profit are pretty despicable and low lifes. There is no question. To take the most precious of our resources, that is our children, and to use them in that manner for profit or for whatever other reason is simply despicable but it happens all too often.

• (1530)

I was just reading something about pornography and the increased availability of pornography. It clearly indicates that there are tens of thousands of children per year in Canada who are used by these unscrupulous—and the word I am thinking about is not parliamentary—individuals who sexually exploit young people and juveniles for profit.

There may be some problems with the bill and I am hoping that we will be able to deal with them quickly at committee. I am not the justice critic. I am just an individual who has real concerns because I have three children. This is the type of legislation that has to be passed.

One of the things that concerns me is right at the beginning of the bill and it deals with the definition of child pornography. The definition says:

> "child pornography" means a photographic, film, video or other visual representation, whether or not it was made by electronic or mechanical means, that shows a person who is or is depicted as being under the age of eighteen years and is engaged in or is depicted as engaged in explicit sexual activity.

That is the definition under this bill of child pornography. I have a little difficulty with that and perhaps some of the legal minds who will be looking at this in committee will make me feel a little more comfortable.

It is not just enough to talk about explicit sexual activity. There are people who prey upon young people for profit and take pictures of our children in positions of undress so that they can sell them to people who get their sexual pleasure this way. I think the definition should be broadened so that any exploitation or exploitative measure that is meant to sexually stimulate other individuals by way of the depiction should be considered obscene.

The difference between the definition of pornography and erotica is vastly different when we are not not dealing with juveniles. When we are dealing with juveniles it is surely a much different situation. The definition of what is pornographic must be tougher when we are dealing with juveniles than when we are dealing with adults.

Clearly most of the provisions of this bill are laudable. It is something with which we absolutely have to grapple. There may be some technical things that we have to fine tune. One of the things the opposition is hoping is that the government will fully co-operate with us in allowing this bill to go to committee and make available immediately all of the appropriate officials from the Department of Justice so that we can get on with our business of fixing this particular piece of the Criminal Code.

The other thing that has to be looked at seriously is the issue of sentences. When we are dealing with sentences for the production of this material and for the distribution of this material then a maximum sentence of 10 years is probably pretty appropriate. We must have a sentence that is long enough to act as a deterrent to those individuals who are intent upon exploiting our children for sexual purposes and for profit.

I would like to once again say that our party and the New Democratic Party, members of both parties, have over the past number of years continued to raise this issue. We have tried to put it on the front burner of the government opposite when we are dealing with legislation.

Indeed, the former Minister of Justice, the pretender to the Tory throne—

Mr. Nicholson: The next Prime Minister.

Mr. MacDonald (Dartmouth): The Minister of the Environment might have something to say about that. The former Minister of Justice, who likes to tout herself as somebody who has been extremely progressive and has brought forward all these pieces of legislation that Canadians have long needed, told us back in 1990 that the government was looking at it. It was a very complex matter.

For anybody out there who wants to know why we have had to wait from 1990 until the sixth last day of this sitting to get the bill I want to show why. It is because altogether this bill has four pages. It took this government three solid years to put together a four-page piece of legislation to try to stop the bottom dwelling, pond scum who exploit our children sexually.

• (1535)

The Liberal Party on this side of the House, I know the New Democratic Party, who will speak next, and I would hope all members of the House will support this legislation as a priority, that we would have very quick hearings, that the Minister of Justice would give us his assurance today that he will treat this in an expeditious manner and make available the appropriate departmental and justice officials so that by the time this Parliament rises we will have a bill that will put an end to the exploitation of our children.

Mr. Ian Waddell (Port Moody—Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I acknowledge you and welcome you to the chair. It is good to have an Albertan in the chair.

I am going to speak for 10 minutes and then let my friend the hon. member for Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing, another westerner, speak for the remaining time.

I want to be quite plain. Since this government was elected in 1984 there has been a special committee on child pornography in 1984, 1985 and 1990 that recommended that Ottawa address this issue. It was not until May 13 of this year, with 24 days scheduled in Parliament at that time, with the House supposed to finish on June 23 but now it may shut down before then, that the government chose to introduce this bill.

If one were a suspicious person one would think that maybe the government is just doing this for a little bit of window dressing and for a future election campaign. However we will treat it as serious because it is a serious matter that has to be addressed.

I would like to explain why we in the New Democratic Party are supporting this bill, although we have some questions and some concerns. I have some concerns because I am basically a civil libertarian and I worry about the restriction of personal freedoms and especially the freedom of the press and the print. However the real question we have to examine concerns why most right-thinking people are against child pornography.

The reason is that the victims of child pornography, the children who are exploited to do this, can later become abusers themselves. A professor in Simon Fraser University's department of criminology, Dr. Ezzat Fattah, is a distinguished criminologist, and one of my constituents, and has written extensively on this issue. He shows how the victims become the criminals.

We in the NDP have set forward a policy, and I know there is support in other places in this House. We would get tough on violent crime and violent criminals but we would also work toward crime prevention.

This bill encompasses both because I think it is ultimately aimed at crime prevention. The Badgley commission recommended such a bill, although I am not sure it dealt with possession. The previous law did not deal with possession and this bill does. The Fraser commission recommended it. In a report to the ministry Dr. Rix Rogers talked about protecting children.

I think all of us in the House feel that we want to protect children and we want this matter dealt with. There is not an industry in Canada or the United States. It comes from offshore. This material is circulated privately.

One of the statements that concerns me is a statement by a metropolitan Toronto police officer. Sometimes the police have been guilty of seizing too many things and of being too zealous in these matters. However he made an interesting statement. He said: "You cannot have child pornography without having child abuse". That is why we are supporting this bill.

We have a whole slew of justice bills, about six bills. They are all going into the committee. I was joking today that I feel like I have the legs of a Texas line dancer, going from committee to committee to committee. We want to give this a hearing.

Remember what the former Minister of Justice said: "Let us have inclusive justice". Inclusive justice means that people from all sides come in and discuss the bill, we have a good hearing and then we get the best bill possible. Then it will hold up in the courts and will not be thrown out as unconstitutional.

• (1540)

I understand that the government can proceed on this partly due to the Butler decision in the Supreme Court, which clearly gives an opening for a law that deals with child pornography. That is another reason that we are supporting the bill.

I want to strongly draw it to the attention of the House, and it might take a little bit of courage to do this at this time, that there is a civil liberties angle to this. We have to be careful not to restrict people's right of disseminating information, no matter how much we dislike the information or what people are saying or arguing. People have a right to argue positions and we may not like them. I am not talking about visually depicting child pornography. I do not think there is any argument there. There is some argument with respect to the written word and what different groups have been advocating. This is a tough area. It is not in the bill and I do not think it should be in the bill. Others may have different viewpoints.

Alan Borovoy, who is the distinguished head of the Canadian Civil Liberties Association, says that he supports the goal of protecting children but not the part of the bill that covers adults who play the part of children. He says:

> It's hard to fathom why in the world the government would want to make it an offence to prohibit adult actors from portraying youngsters.

He continues:

> Once again, you have a bill aimed at sleaze that could wind up imperilling legitimate materials, even works of art.

I hope not, but I think we should call Alan Borovoy before this committee and find out what more he has to say about this and we should examine the clauses of the bill.

Keith Kelly, who is the distinguished director of the Canadian Conference of the Arts and the Writers Guild, is concerned about the onus of proof in the bill. I will quote what he says in *The Toronto Star* to Mr. David Vienneau, a reporter for *The Toronto Star*. Mr. Kelly says:

> The defence of artistic merit exists but the burden of proof—and that is a costly burden—would rest with the person who is charged. We have some very real concerns about this.

Let us get him before the justice committee to tell us what the matter is.

I want to hear from my hon. friend from Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing who has had a private member's bill on this and has done a lot of work on it.

However let me recap as NDP justice critic. We are in favour of this bill. We are concerned about where it impinges on the artistic community and freedom of expression. Let us hear about that in the committee. We want to have an inclusive process. We want to tackle violent crime and at the same time we want to balance that with dealing with crime prevention. All too often the children, the victims of child pornography, end up being abusers themselves. We have to protect those children.

Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of the aims and objectives of this bill to criminalize child pornography and to make the possession of and all other activities dealing with child pornography a crime.

I would like to thank the member for Port Moody—Coquitlam and the member for Dartmouth for their support of my private member's bill. If that private member's bill had any small part to play in moving along the government then I am pleased that has happened.

It is late in the parliamentary session but I do not think that should prevent us from moving as quickly as possible on this bill. Like my colleagues who have already spoken I look forward to the passage of this bill. However I do have a couple of concerns that I would like to raise and have the government mull over. Hopefully in committee we can expeditiously deal with the issues, hear witnesses on some of these complex points and make the bill an even better bill. I will just briefly relate each one.

One that has been raised already is the issue of the definition of child pornography. It is never easy to define these subjects in pieces of legislation. I do think that we should look very carefully at the restrictive definition which, as has already been indicated, really narrows child pornography to the depiction of explicit sexual activity.

• (1545)

I think the vast majority of Canadians would view other areas than explicit sexual activity as pornographic when children are involved. We should explore the opportunity to expand that definition. At the moment I think it is too narrow.

Another point which is worth exploring is the issue of making importation or attempted importation of child pornography a criminal offence. That is not the case under this bill. It seems to me that it is not the case under any other legislation either.

It is clearly the case that child pornography brought into Canada if apprehended by the customs officers would be confiscated, but it is not clear that anybody would be committing an offence by importing or attempting to import it. We should look at that.

Also the bill does not cover pornographic performances involving children. Perhaps we should look at that.

Last, what we have seen in Canada with regard pornography but particularly with regard to child pornography because of the underground nature of it, is that new technology has enabled child pornography to be imported into Canada and then moved around the country very easily through the use of word processors and video recorders.

We need a process—and it was a part of my private member's bill—whereby from time to time we review the way in which child pornography is brought into Canada, produced in Canada and circulated within Canada because of the opportunities which are generated by new developments in technology. I suggest we do something like that.

While I support the government's intentions behind this bill and the thrust of it, and I know that my colleagues in the Liberal Party feel the same, there are a few things we should look at. I look forward to exploring those in the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I think you will find consent for the following motion. I move:

That the motion for second reading of Bill C-128 be amended by having the bill referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Solicitor General, rather than a legislative committee in the Departmental envelope.

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Solicitor General.

* * *

SEIZED PROPERTY MANAGEMENT ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

Hon. Gerry Weiner (for the Minister of Justice) moved that Bill C-123, an act respecting the management of certain property seized or restrained in connection with certain offences, the disposition of certain property on the forfeiture thereof and the sharing of the proceeds of disposition therefrom in certain circumstances be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Rob Nicholson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister of State (Agriculture)): Mr. Speaker I am pleased to rise and speak on third reading of this bill.

Right off the top, I want to say I am not prepared to apologize, nor is the Minister of Justice or anyone on this side of the House, for the justice bills or the number of them that are before the House.

The record of this Parliament will show that there has been continuous government action taken in making this country a better place and a safer place in which to live. When people say: "My heavens, you are doing something with child pornography; you have wire-tap legislation", I make no apologies for it at all. It is part of a continuing process.

To my knowledge, there has not been one month in the last four and a half years in which this Parliament has not been seized with justice legislation. Most of my colleagues on this side of the House have welcomed that and are very pleased to see it.

• (1550)

Hon. members will know that just the changes to the Young Offenders Act alone were a considerable improvement over the provisions that prevailed in the Young Offenders Act when we began this session of Parliament.

Of course we have to react and we have to react quickly. Some of the wire-tap provisions in the Criminal Code were struck down by the Supreme Court of Canada. At that point we did not simply throw up our hands and say: "Well, that is it. We will not revisit this as we do not want to upset somebody in the opposition because we have so much in the area of justice". We did not say that. We said: "All right. If there is a problem with one of the wire-tap sections, let us have a look at it", and we have changed it.

In the area of child pornography I hope members of the House will support and expedite that. We have already had a couple of attempts at it. It was very difficult, quite frankly, to get that kind of co-operation to move a bill on pornography through the House.

The bill before us now deals with the proceeds of crime. It works in conjunction with a whole host of initiatives and I mentioned the wire-tap legislation. I will explain why we are bringing them in.

The people working against making Canada a wonderful place to live, the people involved with crime in this country, are very sophisticated. There is quite a bit of money involved with these things. Therefore, should the law be constantly updated and reviewed to make sure we have the tools to effectively combat crime?

My answer and that of members on this side of the House is that yes, Canadians want us to do that. This has been confirmed in every questionnaire I have sent out in my riding. I questioned people on a whole host of issues, including crime prevention. I asked them what they thought about the distribution of the proceeds of crime, sharing it with law enforcement jurisdictions. Overwhelmingly people said that it was a good idea.

So when my colleague, the Minister of Justice, introduces a piece of legislation I can say that it certainly goes with my complete blessing and full support. That is what we have here. This bill which deals with the proceeds of crime is a good one.

When people ask me about crime prevention, I say we must get at the profits from crime. That is one way to help prevent crime. This was mentioned in the debate on the previous bill. There is big money in pornography. Let us get to the source of that.

This bill provides for effective management of assets that are seized by the Crown. As well it gives us a regime, a framework whereby we can share the proceeds of crime with the law enforcement community. People may say: "Well, you do not have the regulations". Of course the regulations are not there but we will work that out. It is important for Parliament to state its intention to distribute the proceeds of crime in a fair manner.

Forfeiture and seizure is not an easy process. We had the example of a skiing resort in Quebec that was seized by the Crown at least three years ago. There is still an appeal process going on. The ownership of that does not preside with the Crown at the present time, but we have an obligation to effectively manage it on behalf of the individual from whom it was taken. We owe that individual an obligation until the case is decided one way or another. If it is forfeited to the Crown, we need to have a regime in place for the distribution of that.

This is one part of the government's program but it is an important part. As I say, for my money every month since this Parliament was sworn in over four years ago, we have been seized with justice issues. These issues have the support of people in my riding of Niagara Falls and a lot of ridings across the country.

• (1555)

I do not apologize for the fact that this Parliament is spending time on this. Most Canadians worry about these things and they are reassured when they see their parliamentarians bringing legislation forward that will help make this country a safer one in which to live.

Mr. Ron MacDonald (Dartmouth): Mr. Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the hon. member for Moncton who also has some things to say on this piece of legislation.

I listened with interest to the introduction of the remarks by my hon. colleague who is representing the government on this legislation. Maybe he protests just a little too much. He is unusually sensitive today to observations by the opposition.

I think it was the New Democratic member who said that some people would be cynical in wondering why the government waited until five days before probably the end of its time in office before it came in with this law and order series of legislation.

When trying to support his minister, the current Minister of Justice, the hon. member indicated that he has worked quite hard. There has been a bill a minute, a bill a day, or something like coming into the House lately dealing with justice reform.

It is too bad the former Minister of Justice was not as diligent. The former Minister of Justice, every time I read an article in the newspaper or *Maclean's*, likes to claim about all the tough work she has done in the Department of Justice. It is just too bad she did not suffer from the same work ethic the hon. member feels the current Minister of Justice has as he brings these bills in hand over fist, faster than a speeding bullet. But I guess that is what happens when a minister's eyesight is focused on another seat to occupy in the House of Commons.

Let us just say that Bill C-123 on the proceeds of crime should have been here a heck of a long time ago. This bill simply changes the legislation that has been on the books since about 1989 dealing with the proceeds of crime.

When somebody is convicted of trafficking in illegal drugs, the assets would be seized and those assets would be disposed of. The value of those assets or the assets themselves would revert to the Crown.

Clearly this was an attempt by the Crown to get right down to the root cause of this, as my colleague has said. People who sell drugs or are engaged in child pornography do so for a profit. If we could seize the profits then that would be an additional penalty to the incarceration or fine they would get under the law. It is about time that this has happened.

It is not really the federal government. We make the laws here. With the exception of the RCMP which is a federal force, it nearly always goes to the municipal police force. The municipal police force, which is controlled and paid for by municipal taxes, hunts out these low life and arrests them. It builds a case against them, takes it to the courts and sees them properly prosecuted and if convicted, incarcerated. It is the provincial and not the federal government in most cases and the municipal governments that bear the costs of the administration of justice in these and other cases.

The legislation of 1989 was good in its intent in that it was seizing the assets or the profits of the criminal activity. However, one would beg to ask why the value of that would go over to the federal government and not the provincial one.

Just to highlight my point, in my riding of Dartmouth there are two police forces. There is the RCMP in the county. It is woefully understaffed and that has caused big problems with morale and its pursuit of the administration of justice in keeping the community safe. It does the best job it can with the resources it is given.

However, to give an idea of what the municipal police forces are facing, in times of recession these types of crimes go up. In times of recession there are more break and enters. There is more violent crime. There is more trafficking in drugs. There is an increase in all kinds of criminal activity where there is a profit to be made.

In my riding of Dartmouth the current chief of police, Chief McRae, and the former chief, Chief Cole, will tell you that in the last two years because of cutbacks in transfers to the provinces by the federal government and then cutbacks in transfers from the provincial government to the municipal government, they have had to freeze their budgets.

• (1600)

They have frozen their budgets at $11 million over the last two years but there has been no freeze on the crime rate. The crime rate continues to accelerate but because of the type of downloading of debt from the federal government there has not been a corresponding increase in the level of resources given to municipal police forces like the police force in Dartmouth.

They tell me in Dartmouth that not only is crime going up as resources are frozen but they are now absorbing costs previously absorbed by the RCMP, the federal law enforcement agency. In affect costs have been downloaded from the federal government to the provincial or municipal level.

Budgets are frozen, crime is on the increase, there is no money coming to help them from anywhere and even the RCMP, which has seen its budget frozen over the last few years is now talking about charging municipal police forces user fees for forensic work. As budgets have been frozen and other costs have continued to escalate Dartmouth has lost 13 officers over a period of two years which is a 10 per cent reduction.

I called just before this bill came up and was told the cost of undercover work, if it was contracted out, would be $60 per hour per officer. Usually in drug undercover work there are at least two officers required as well as a patrol car. The work is not usually done during daylight hours so overtime is paid in many cases.

The cost of law enforcement when it comes to trying to break some of these drug rings and crack down on the distribution and sale of illegal drugs in our communities is excessive. In Dartmouth in the last year we have statistics showing there were 108 trafficking charges in a city of 68,000 to 70,000 people. There were 73 possession charges and 181 people taken into custody.

They tell me in Dartmouth there has been a significant increase in the level of crime since 1991, primarily because of the economy and this government–made recession, however there has been no increase in the level of resources given to combat these crimes. This bill goes somewhat in the direction of rectifying this.

Instead of the federal government getting the value of the assets that are confiscated in cases of criminal activity, particularly dealing with illegal drugs, some of these proceeds will go down to the provincial and municipal governments. They will not be going down to the respective police forces but hopefully they will find their way to the forces that are expending resources to get rid of the low life that is infecting our communities far too often.

This is the type of legislation that perhaps we should have more debate on. We are at third reading so it has gone to committee but there are some questions that will probably still have to be asked. It is unfortunate that we are pushing this through as quickly as we are but in the dying days of the government, with six days left before these guys opposite are kicked out of office for a good long time, I guess they are trying their very best to at least put it on the record that after nine years they did try to address some of the serious flaws in the criminal justice system.

Mr. George S. Rideout (Moncton): Mr. Speaker, the member for Dartmouth has really captured the spirit of what is going on here. There is no question that in the dying days of a dying government this type of legislation will be put on the record with no hope that it will ever be adopted.

I think we are fooling the government because we have been working night and day in order to see some of this legislation passed and see some progress. In this particular bill on the proceeds of crime I think we are all supportive of what is going on.

I can tell the member for Dartmouth who really captured the spirit of it, I know of what he speaks. I was the mayor of Moncton a few years ago and I have a real appreciation of what it is like to run a municipal police force. I appreciate the costs associated with it and the number of men and women needed on the force to just try to stem the tide of crime. As the member from Dartmouth has so eloquently said, throw in a government-made recession and the cost escalates that much more.

We were successful in Moncton in negotiating with the provincial government on something completely different. We had to look after traffic violations, speeders and those types of people and all the fines went to the province. We were able to negotiate with the province to get some of the money from fines returned to the municipality. It could be reinvested in our police forces so they could arrest more speeders and use it for other types of crime prevention.

• (1605)

I think that is what we have to be concerned about with this legislation. There is no question that the legislation has indicated that the minister can and does have the power to distribute the proceeds of crime to other levels of government.

The concern I have as I read the definitions and look at what is going on is that this legislation just provides the minister with authority. It does not make distribution mandatory. It makes it questionable as to how this money is going to be divided and whether it will actually get down to the police force that is doing the work. I think that is the critical thing.

If it just ends up in the general revenue of the provincial or municipal government coffers and is not earmarked for crime prevention, investigation and all the things that have to be done then I do not think we are really serving the citizens properly.

I am sure each and every one of us has seen some of the alarming statistics concerning the amount of money that is now earned by the drug barons of the world and the sophistication and type of equipment that is now being used by elicit drug traders. If we are not going to match that expenditure with similar expenditures within our forces then we are going to face some very serious problems.

They are simply going to dominate the situation by sheer weight of wealth and they certainly have done that in the past. At the same time we in government and particularly at the federal government level have been passing restraint on and on down the line until it gets to the municipality that is not capable of providing or having the resources to provide the proper equipment for the police force. Yet we demand that those forces arrest and control the situation.

We on this side are supportive of this legislation. We are anxious to see it better defined so we know exactly where the dollars are going. We want to see it earmarked for use primarily against the drug traffic as well as on the front lines. The troops on the front lines need the resources to fight crime. That is why we are supportive of this legislation.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Before I recognize the hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam it is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 38 to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for St. Boniface—Student aid; the hon. member for Parkdale—High Park—Crime prevention; the hon. member for Okanagan—Shuswap—Trade; the hon. member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley—Health care.

Mr. Ian Waddell (Port Moody—Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, the justice committee report, *Crime Prevention in Canada*, says clearly in recommendation No. 3 that the share of the moneys forfeited as proceeds of crime be allocated to crime prevention activities.

This is the bill the government is presenting. It is about forfeiture of moneys and property the police have been able to get. It seems to me the government had a golden opportunity to take the second step toward a national program of crime prevention and that was to have a

guaranteed means of funding crime prevention through this mechanism. I think it would be supported by the public. An editorial in *The Ottawa Citizen* said the government missed a good investment.

The government did make an amendment to the bill today which originally said that the moneys were supposed to go to the debt reduction fund. Now it has left it open and by regulation it can still go to crime prevention.

As I said to the hon. member for Calgary a few hours ago quoting Mick Jagger: "You can't always get what you want but you will find sometimes you might get what you need". What we need is money for crime prevention. What we have is a clause that allows it to happen. I give the parliamentary secretary his due here. He said today that he would do his best to see that those moneys were allocated for crime prevention and so did the Minister of Justice. That is on the record here of the House of Commons. He can rest assured that we will keep reminding him of that particular record. Let us not lose a golden opportunity. Let us get some funds to crime prevention.

• (1610)

Before I sit down I want to add two more points. The first point is that in terms of crime prevention and moneys, the government should not forget that jobs and employment are related to violence and crime. We are seeing the beginning of youth violence in this country and it is scary whether they are breaking into the legislature in B.C. on an environmental process or whether it is the Nazi youth here in Ottawa last week against another group of youth who were protesting against the Nazis. It is scary and it is beginning.

There is overwhelming evidence to show that there is a strong connection between employment and crime, particularly violent crime. An extensive 1990 study of data from the preceding 40 years prepared by the British home office of the United Kingdom dramatically identified: "the profound importance of economic factors in the determination of crime. A comparison of personal consumption per capita, with both property and personal crimes in Britain and other countries, revealed that the significance of these factors goes beyond national borders". It goes to Canada as well.

When the study examined unemployment rates it found: "Growth in offences of violence against the person was also found to be associated with growth in unemployment during the previous year—the relation was strong". These are real studies. I have them and I will show them to the House.

There is also evidence to show that Canadians understand this connection and view crime prevention as a broadly applied policy. While politicians in general continue to subscribe to the myth of neo-Conservative, tough on crime rhetoric, recent survey data suggests that Canadians do not see an increasingly punitive justice system alone as an effective defence against crime.

A survey done for the Canadian Sentencing Commission found that the most popular solution to crime was to reduce the level of unemployment. In a poll regarding the effective ways to control crime, 41 per cent of Canadians said to reduce the level of unemployment; 27 per cent said to make sentences harsher; 13 per cent said to increase the use of non-imprisonment sentencing such as restitution to community service officers; 4 per cent said to increase the number of police officers and 10 per cent said to increase the number of social programs.

The government, in its so-called law and order agenda which is mainly full of rhetoric, is basically phoney and on the wrong track. The right track is to be tough on violent crime and criminals but at the same time balance this with a crime prevention program. We must get at people, particularly young people, before they become criminals.

Did you see the news last night and the story from Cape Breton about the 20-year old kid who murdered the people in the McDonald's? We wonder how we could have reached that obviously disturbed person earlier and perhaps helped him or the family or taken that person right out of society if that was the necessary thing to do. That is the real challenge for crime prevention in the future. That is what I call getting tough on crime. That is what I call being effective on crime. We owe it to the kids.

A kindergarten teacher could tell us about children who could be in trouble in the future. We need to intervene early and have programs for crime prevention, but we have to fund those programs.

We in the NDP give our consent today to the third reading of this bill so it gets through. We urge the government to implement its promises to this House today that money taken from criminal activities, from the forfeiture of moneys from crime, go toward crime prevention because crime prevention is the way of the future.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion.

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): It is my understanding that we can call it five o'clock.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): If the hon. member for Abitibi were here we could carry on, or I could suspend the House.

Some hon. members: Suspend.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I will suspend the House to the call of the Chair.

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Maybe the Whip can get a hold of the hon. member.

The sitting of the House was suspended at 4.16 p.m.

SITTING RESUMED

The House resumed at 4.25 p.m.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Pursuant to Standing Order 30(6) the House will now proceed to consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*Translation*]

STATUS OF WOMEN

MOTION FOR PAYMENT OF A SALARY TO WOMEN WHO REMAIN AT HOME

Mr. Guy Saint-Julien (Abitibi) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider paying a salary to women who remain at home.

He said: Mr. Speaker, we all know that, in 1991, I received many petitions from men and women in my constituency saying that a salary should be paid to women who remain at home. I tabled the petition which was deemed out of order because it requested an amount of $12,000. Immediately following this refusal, and in compliance with the procedure of the House of Commons, I took the initiative of presenting the petition in the form of a motion which read: "That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider paying a salary to women who remain at home". We all know that the procedure of the House of Commons consists of a draw. I was lucky last month, since my name was drawn. Among the 21 motions which I tabled in this House, and which are the result of consultations with my constituents about what can be done for my constituency, I chose this particular motion.

We all know that most Canadian women spend at least part of their life being at home full time. Almost half of these women do not belong to the work force, and less than one third of those who have preschool children hold a full time job.

When it comes to raising children, Canadian parents seem full of good intentions regarding work sharing. However, for better or worse, work at home remains a woman's job.

Genetically, nothing predisposes women to housework. In practice, however, women do most of the housework. That is why I am referring to "women who remain at home" here, meaning mothers at home.

In Canada, women who stay at home work full time and even do overtime. Studies show that they work between 41 and 60 hours a week, depending on how many children they have and how old they are. Women at home are on duty 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Try to find a more demanding job.

These women work mainly at home. Their husbands, children and other family members benefit most directly from their work, but they are not the only ones. Thus, paying a salary to women who remain at home would stimulate the economy because they would spend this money on basic necessities such as better food, more durable clothes and so on.

Employers also benefit in other ways from women at home. The fact that women at home run the household and look after the other members of the family makes it easier for their husbands to devote all their energies to a gainful, full-time job outside the home.

Finally, in a more general way, women at home prepare the future in that they are raising the next generation of citizens. To reproduce generation after generation, we need a dynamic, healthy population.

What price should we put on the work of these women who are on the front lines 24 hours a day to do everything? It is estimated that if housework were included in the gross national product, it would amount to 35 or 40 per cent of the GNP, or at least $136 billion.

That is a lot of money. Yet women at home have no way of converting this work into cash. Unlike other workers in our society, women at home are not paid a salary. And because they are unpaid, they have no days off, no unemployment insurance and no accident, disability or sickness benefits. Even more serious in the long run, they do not have a pension plan.

• (1630)

But like all other workers, women at home do reach retirement age too. There comes a time when they can no longer perform all the tasks they used to. What happens then? After serving their families and society for all those years, many women at home end their days in poverty. It is sad to see the personal economic contribution of these women go completely unrecognized.

The former Social Credit member, Mr. Lambert, who lives in Berthier-sur-Mer, was telling me today that no government has ever calculated how much the work of women at home is worth. Ms. Judith Richard, who was an assistant to the late Réal Caouette and whom I met today at the same time, told me to convey the same message to the people of Canada.

It is unacceptable that women at home live in financial insecurity all their lives, especially when they reach retirement age, after a lifetime of working for their families and society as a whole. Mothers who decide to start working, often under poor conditions, do so because they receive no salary to stay at home, raise children and do all the work that entails. This is extra work on top of the work they still have to do at home.

Mothers are divided into two categories: working mothers and mothers who stay at home full time. Even those expressions are charged with emotion. If some women are working mothers, what are women who do not work? If some women are full-time mothers, does that mean that those who work outside the home are part-time mothers?

Housewives do not get any personal benefits under the Canada Pension Plan or the Quebec Pension Plan. Proposals aimed at sharing pension credits between spouses are good, but they do not take into account the value of the work performed by the housewife, since the couple's total pension is not increased.

Kathy Cooke said that women who stay at home sacrifice the production capacity of half our potential active labour force.

It is obvious that, for some people, the words "employment" and "work" apply to everything except the situation of mothers who stay at home.

Here is what was written on a recent census form from the government of Saskatchewan: If you have worked at home all your life, indicate never worked. People think that value and money are synonymous.

Mr. Gérard Amyotte, program director at Health and Welfare Canada's Social Service Programs Branch wrote this: "Often times, women who stay at home with their children are not considered as workers because they receive no salary. In our society, unpaid work is often not recognized and not appreciated. Social values are focused on the worth of an individual as measured by his or her professional status or pay cheque, instead of the amount of time spent on caring for others".

Kid First, an organization established in 1987 in Calgary, has put forward a suggestion. They want to protect the right of families to choose the type of child care best suited to their needs. They want to restore the right to choose and are aiming for equal rights and financial treatment for every possible option.

In 1970, the Royal Commission on the Status of Women said: "The housewife who remains at home is just as much a producer of goods and services as the paid worker."

There is hope when we hear a federal minister like the minister responsible for the status of women say that she would like to give women some money to spend on food, clothes or day care for their children.

Health Canada Inc., an insurance company, recently announced that it intends to provide disability insurance for spouses who remain at home, hence recognizing the value of the work they do at home.

Glenda Simms, president of the Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women, acknowledged on April 4, 1992 that the present definition of work does discriminate against women who remain at home.

We also take heart from statements made in the House of Commons such as the one the hon. member for Calgary North made on May 15, 1992: "We have to review our approach and make laws which would be above all fair to every family, reaffirm the first and foremost responsbility of parents and allow them to choose what they feel is the best way to raise their children".

An article published in the February 1992 issue of *Châtelaine* showed that many professional women are now deciding to remain at home with their children. That is what they want.

• (1635)

Here are some thoughts on the legal aspects: Section 15 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms says that every individual has the right to the equal protection and equal benefit of the law without discrimination. The present tax laws do not give mothers equal treatment. Some are favoured but not others, which is contrary to the democratic principle of equal opportunity.

Under subsection 136(1), the government is committed to promoting equal opportunity for the welfare of Canadians. The present tax laws do not give equal opportunity to parents who decide that one of the spouses should stay at home.

Here are some thoughts on legal definitions: work—a woman at home works, does something besides looking after her own welfare, is useful to society and contributes to the GNP. We must show that her work is useful to the proper running of society, to the welfare of the children and spouse she looks after so her spouse can work at a paid job with peace of mind. We must show that the work of women at home contributes to society because they prepare a generation of healthy, well-educated, stable citizens who will provide services when we are old.

We are not alone in the world and Canadians are not the only ones to try to solve the problem of full-time mothers. Most other countries are grappling with the same issue. In 1970 the Royal Commission on the Status of Women recognized that child care is a responsibility which must be shared by mothers, fathers and society. In 1983, the Hon. Flora MacDonald, a Conservative minister, said: "I agree that more must be done to recognize the contribution to society of women who work at home".

In February 1983, the Hon. Judy Erola, the Liberal minister responsible for the status of women, said: "I think that we must find ways to strengthen the family by reviewing the family benefits in our tax system." "I think it is important to extend these benefits to all types of families: those with children, whether one of the spouses stays at home or both are in the labour force—which is the case for most families with children—, and families with only one parent who stays at home or is in the labour force."

In 1983, the member for Kamloops, an NDP member, said in the House of Commons: "I will continue to ask the minister to reform the tax system so as to favour all family situations, a system which recognizes the cost and work involved in raising children, regardless of marital status or income level, a system which gives women at home the same status and recognition as those in the labour market". In 1984, a national survey showed that 81 per cent of Canadians were in favour of spouses participating in the Canada or Quebec Pension Plan. Spouses at home are still not entitled to a pension, however.

In June 1986, the Minister of State (Transport) a Conservative minister, was quoted in the *Western Producer* as saying: "If we pay for a universal day care program, why not provide money for women who stay at home, if that is their choice? Almost 50 per cent of Canadian women still stay at home to look after their children". In October 1986, Michael D. Harris, a member of the Ontario Legislative Assembly, said: "We must certainly not refuse those women who want to make a career in

various fields, but we must still recognize and help those who dedicate their lives to their families".

I quote what Fred Driscoll, the acting minister of health and social services of Prince Edward Island, said in April 1986: "If we consider public funding for day care, we should ask whether women who stay at home do not have rights as well. This is a group that may have been neglected". As far as I am concerned, it is a group that has been neglected.

I believe that some social policies should be tried out, especially a salary to women who remain at home. The Royal Commission on the Economic Union and Development Prospects for Canada, the Macdonald commission, proposed a thorough overhaul of our social security system. It suggested that Canada implement a universal income security program, UISP, which basically meant a guaranteed annual income for all families.

The idea that the government should offer everyone a guaranteed annual income, which was controversial in the 1960s, became a fundamental recommendation of a royal commission. Are experiments with policies yesterday's failure or tomorrow's hope? Labour supply is an important issue in evaluating income support and other social policies, because disincentives to work are a powerful argument against such programs.

• (1640)

Proposals to reform income support or social insurance programs in Canada have many times run up against the fear that changing the benefits for those who are able to work could be counter-productive. Basically, the fear is that money transfers may reduce the incentive to work.

Since a guaranteed annual income is far superior as a way to supplement the income of all those who need it, not only low-income workers according to the 1986 paper by Humm and Simpson, the idea of a guaranteed annual income to eliminate poverty is strengthened, since we must not hide the fact that poverty is a persistent social problem in Canada.

I urge the government to make the situation of women at home a priority and to take the necessary action to recognize their rights to fair compensation.

In closing, I would like to thank all the many women and men who have expressed their support to me since 1991, as well as all those who signed petitions and who telephoned me. I cannot name them all here and I trust that they will excuse me, but nevertheless, I would like to thank especially Beverley Smith of Calgary, whose study "Throwing Out the Baby with the Bathwater" was very helpful to me in this debate, as well as the newspaper *Vers demain*, or *Michael*, as it is known in English.

We have often seen posters in federal and provincial ridings demanding $12,000 as a salary for women at home. I wish to thank them and the National Federation of French Canadian Women for the sound ideas they defend in this cause.

We know today that I have waited since 1991 to discuss this subject in the House of Commons, but today I have the opportunity of putting in the Notice Paper some questions concerning payment of a salary to women who remain at home. I will also have an opportunity to repeat this motion in the House of Commons. I say especially to women throughout Canada and mothers at home and children: Don't give up.

We still make speeches. I mentioned some distinguished Canadians who had made speeches in legislative assemblies, national assemblies, the House of Commons, on paying a salary to women who remain at home, that is mothers at home.

We have an example in the bill respecting precautionary cessation of work for pregnant women. Since 1990, thanks to women in the government and in the labour movement and working women, we have fought for three years to have precautionary cessation of employment recognized in the Canada Labour Code. We will begin third reading of it on Monday. It took us three years. Today in this House we are beginning to try to find a solution for mothers who stay at home, who work 24 hours a day, who are awakened at night when their children have problems.

I say to people and to members of this House in all political parties: Let us work together and try to find a solution on salaries for women who remain at home. I say that in a few months, it would be an excellent idea from a government, of whatever stripe that government is. It is important today when we talk about poverty. We talk a lot about all sorts of federal and provincial programs, but we never had a royal commission on salaries for women who remain at home, that is mothers at home.

I want to thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I wish all women good luck. I also say to all men who want to help us that they should write with their member of Parliament in every federal riding in Canada. It is free, because when you write to your MP, you do not have to pay postage. But the important thing is to contact your MP of whatever party so that the message gets through, even if it takes months. We must not stop, we must win this victory.

[*English*]

Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing): Mr. Speaker, let me first of all commend the member for Abitibi for raising this issue in the House of Commons and for putting forward the motion that the government should consider paying a salary to women who remain at home. For far too long, I suppose from the beginning of time, society has undervalued the work women do in raising children and in the unpaid work they often do in the home. It is well past the time we should be considering what to do about this particular issue and how to find a solution to the evaluation of the quantification of work in the home which is presently unpaid and how we are going to provide payment for that work.

• (1645)

Canada was a signatory to the 1985 World Conference on Women wherein the so-called Nairobi forward looking strategies on the advancement of women were adopted. That international commitment on the part of Canada was included. It called on all nations including Canada to ensure that women's paid work and unpaid work are quantified and valued.

Canada has made an international commitment to address the issue of unpaid work by women who remain at home. We also have the problem of work that women perform as caregivers even though they may be working outside the home at another job. They come home and spend many hours on the very important activity of raising children. We do not compensate them for that.

We have an international commitment. We have various statements of support from government members and from ministers, but as yet no action and not even any investigation into the issue of paying women for what is presently unpaid work or any effort to work on the best way to ensure the quantification and the payment.

As with all social issues and as with all options and choices countries and governments have available to them, it is an issue that must be looked at in a wider context. Women who have worked in the home all their lives and have not worked outside the home have very severe difficulties when they reach the age of receiving the pension, particularly if their partners do not live with them or have died. Their limitations to pension obligations, pensions from Canada, mean they very often live in poverty.

We have the problem of how to quantify the work women do that is presently unpaid, how to pay for that work, and how to change the pension legislation in Canada to ensure the work done provides eligibility for the Canada Pension Plan and the Quebec Pension Plan. Women are disadvantaged in many respects with regard to their eligibility for pensions and with regard to not being paid for the work they do.

We have to bear in mind the work being done in the home by women. It is done by men also but it is primarily done by women in Canada. The raising of children, our most important resource, is one of the most, if not the most, important functions we ask any citizen to perform. To continue to see this contribution as one which should not be paid for, as one which is not valued in the sense that it does receive compensation is something, I think we would all agree, in need of change. We have that context to bear in mind too.

There is one last point we need to bear in mind as well. It falls within the same difficulties of quantifying, valuing and so on.

• (1650)

On average women receive something like two-thirds of what men receive in terms of income. There are enormous inequities in terms of equal pay for work of equal value. Women over time and to this day receive less than men for the same work in some instances and certainly less than men for work of equal value. We have to address that issue too.

To get to the main point raised by the member opposite, until we recognize the value of the work women perform in the home which is presently unpaid and recognize it as giving rise to an entitlement to payment, we will never recognize the important role women play in society to the extent we need to. We will continue to see other problems of equal pay for work of equal value and so on not receiving the attention they deserve.

In closing let me confirm my support and my party's support for the member's motion. Let me congratulate him for raising it. I look forward in the not too distant future to action being taken so that the work women do which is presently unpaid will be paid. It is important for the government to make a commitment to ensure progress in this area.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yvon Côté (Richmond—Wolfe): Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to join my colleague from Abitibi and the previous speaker for the New Democratic Party in a discussion of this sensitive and very important issue of compensation for women who remain at home.

I am sure no one objects to the principle as such. I would say the government's efforts in this respect, especially during the past eight years, are reflected in the way it is channelling benefits to women, one example being the benefits that have just been endorsed by this House.

However, although I agree with the principle, I intend to demonstrate that implementing this motion raises a number of practical questions as well as the question of equity.

In any case, I welcome this opportunity to speak to this item of Private Members' Business, Motion No. 563, which reads as follows:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider paying a salary to women who remain at home.

First of all, let us look at the objectives of this motion. It proposes that the government pay a salary to a group of persons under certain conditions. Payment of a salary implies that such payment is made for services rendered.

Today I would like to discuss how these services would be defined and how they would be quantified under this kind of government program. I would also like to consider how a government program could offer a salary exclusively to women, for such is the wording of the motion, who remain in the home and not to other persons who might provide the same services.

Subsequently, I intend to show that any attempt to implement such a program would soon face serious problems, whether we are talking about equity or practical aspects, that would probably be insurmountable.

When developing a government program that provides for paying a salary to a group of persons, we must assume, first of all, that this group can be clearly defined, and second, that payment would be made for the services they provide. However, the proposal put forward in the motion by the member for Abitibi does not meet either of these fundamental criteria.

Let me explain. First, let us look at how the target clientele, women who remain in the home—according to the wording of the motion—would be defined for the purposes of eligibility for a government benefit.

The group "women" is a group that is readily identifiable, of course, and could be defined so as to include all persons of the female sex, 18 years of age or over, for instance. However, the Charter of Rights and Freedoms expressly prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex, and the government has had to change its own programs to eliminate this concept, because it constituted discrimination.

• (1655)

This means the government cannot introduce a program that discriminates against members of one sex, as this motion sets out to do. A way would have to be found to include men who remain at home and look after the children, for instance. It will be necessary to identify persons, and I say "persons" who remain at home, without reference to men or women.

How would a government program implement this concept? The government could not simply ask people whether they see themselves as "remaining at home", since the question would be too subjective. Another criterion could be labour market participation. For instance, all gainfully employed workers could be excluded. But in that case, what about self-employed workers who work at home and who apply for a salary as persons who "remain at home"? Should these workers be excluded? And if so, how? What about part-time workers who spend part of their time at home? So you see how hard it would be to implement this kind of concept.

What about the unemployed who are at home? Should all these people be included as well, and if so, according to what criteria?

And finally, as we all know, because of the way the unemployment insurance system works, paying benefits to people who are not employed can often have undesirable side effects. People normally want to maximize their consumption of products, services and leisure, including products and services they can produce by themselves. This means that if the government were to provide benefits to people who are not on the job market, some people would see this as an incentive to get out of the job market in order to get the so-called "free" benefits offered by the government under this kind of system. Does the government really want to encourage this attitude? The answer is pretty obvious.

It is clear that it is not easy to find a fool-proof criterion for identifying persons who "remain at home". I think that is obvious from the few examples I gave and the questions I raised. There would perhaps be a way to establish a link between "salary" and "remain at the home". The link between salary and individual income could ensure that all women who remain at home receive an income. However, most programs that are based on an assessment of the level of income already take into account the family income, which is the best yardstick for the resources available to each member of the family.

Another way would be to tie the salary to the presence of children in the home, in the case of either men or women, or perhaps to the care of parents or other family members who are disabled. Establishing this link between salary and the presence of children in the home is fairly easy. We already use this criterion for the child tax credit and the Canada Pension Plan exclusion clause for raising children, for instance. Tying salary to care provided for disabled family members may be more difficult to do on a permanent basis. However, assuming this problem can be solved, let us consider the concept of "salary" in the proposal presented by the hon. member for Abitibi.

As I said earlier, the salary concept presupposes that payment is made for services rendered.

• (1700)

We are all familiar with the many and sometimes difficult tasks performed by those men or women who stay at home. These would include raising children, looking after the whole family, or perhaps just taking care of a spouse or even themselves. Furthermore, many people who remain at home become caregivers for the elderly or handicapped relatives living with them. Others give their time as volunteer workers to all kinds of charitable organizations.

I am sure most people will agree that, in practical or realistic terms, the government could not consider implementing such a policy. On the one hand, there would be discrimination and, on the other hand, it would be impossible to quantify the work of men and women staying at home according to the type of services.

For those reasons, I am unable to endorse this motion whose objective, although worthwhile, is beyond any conceivable implementation.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): As no other member wishes to speak, the hour provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired. Pursuant ot Standing Order 96(1), this item is dropped from the Order Paper.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

CRIME PREVENTION

Mr. Jesse Flis (Parkdale—High Park): Mr. Speaker, on March 17 I asked a question of the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada about the recommendations made at the national symposium in Toronto.

I reminded the minister that at the symposium four ministers confirmed that the way to reduce crime and make our community safer is to do something about poverty, illiteracy, unemployment and the lack of adequate housing. Four ministers said that the true roots of crime are poverty, illiteracy, unemployment and the lack of adequate housing. In his reply the minister did not say

what the government is doing to address those four issues.

I went on in my supplementary to ask the minister what he is doing about responding to a letter from Toronto City Councillor Chris Korwin-Kuczynski, Toronto Metropolitan Councillor Derwyn Shea, the MPP for Parkdale, Tony Ruprecht, and myself. We sent it in November 1992 to the current defence minister who was then Minister of Justice. To this day we have received no reply from that minister. I guess she was busy preparing for her leadership race even back then. To this date there are no programs based on the recommendations from the national symposium.

It is one thing to spend millions of taxpayers' dollars to call a forum in the city of Toronto where there is a high crime rate, make recommendations and then do nothing about it. I do want to congratulate the minister for listening to our recommendations about returning seized property and assets to local jurisdictions when there is a crime bust. I was pleased that we passed Bill C-123 in this House today. I do compliment the government for its action on that issue. It finally listened to what the people were asking for.

I hope the parliamentary secretary can highlight what the recommendations of this national symposium were and what legislation the government has in place now. I do not know why it took the government nine years to introduce legislation to make our community safer. I guess it is because there is an election coming up. All of a sudden, they are coming up with the legislation that should have been implemented four, five or nine years ago.

• (1705)

Mr. Speaker, you are giving me the signal that my time is up. I hope you will give the parliamentary secretary a little more time so that he can provide better answers than the minister did during Question Period.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Charles A. Langlois (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and to Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I will try to provide the most accurate answers to the hon. member for Parkdale—High Park.

I want to tell him that the justice system is in a good position to be a true leader in terms of improving safety of our communities and urging all sectors of our society to work together toward community development, while at the same time limiting crime to a minimum. The Minister of Justice is committed to developing a national strategy on community safety and crime prevention, in co-operation with the numerous governmental and non-governmental agencies which promote safety.

Last March the national symposium on community safety and crime prevention gathered officials from these organizations. The participants reached an exceptional consensus after in-depth discussions on issues such as violence, fear of crime, vulnerable groups in society, search for a balance, and the creation of communities and partnerships.

The participants developed a set of principles for a national strategy. First, this strategy should provide for a comprehensive approach, in that it should go beyond the traditional notion of justice, which focuses strictly on the offender, and take into account the impact of the crime on the victim and the community.

Second, the strategy should be aimed at the causes and not only at the symptoms. The discussions held reflected the recommendations of the Standing Committee on Justice and the Solicitor General on this issue. In Canada, as well as at the international level, it is increasingly recognized that poverty, unemployment, racism, sexism, drug addictions, and limited education and training opportunities are conducive to crime. It is also recognized that measures to improve these conditions will directly contribute to making communities safer.

In conclusion, this strategy should be based on a partnership which includes community organizations, police forces, local authorities, the governments of the First Nations, provincial and federal authorities, as well as non-governmental organizations.

[*English*]

NORTH AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (Okanagan—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, some time ago I raised a question in the House about water diversions and bulk water transports being vulnerable or part of the provisions of the North American free trade agreement.

The government has hidden behind its argument that water is not included in the North American free trade agreement nor is there any provision for the bulk transport of water through either this agreement or the FTA.

The fact is that without a specific exclusion for bulk water transports, whether they be through interbasin transfers, tanker transports or pipeline transports, water is very much part and parcel of both the free trade agreement and the North American free trade agreement. There has been considerable expert opinion tabled in this regard, some of it tabled right in the legislative committee for the NAFTA agreement.

I want to clarify some of the misconceptions that the government has by reading a submission from the Rawson Academy of Aquatic Science regarding NAFTA and water exports. It says: "Without an exclusion water is certainly part of the agreement". That is referring to the NAFTA. "Any good or service covered by a tariff heading annexed to the NAFTA is subject to the rights and obligations set out in the agreement itself". Tariff heading 22.01 of the North American free trade agreement is as follows: "Waters including natural or artificial mineral waters and aerated waters not containing added sugar or other sweetening matter, ice and snow".

The document from the Rawson Academy of Sciences goes on to explain the specific exclusion of water as a commodity of trade under tariff item article 22.01 which is referred to in both the North American free trade agreement and the FTA. This is an article I should add that was just released a short time ago, April 1993. It goes on to say: "It has been upheld by recognized and respected Canadian experts in international trade and resource law that naturally flowing water is indeed covered under tariff heading 22.01. Even the Ottawa law firm that the federal government referenced in the water trade debate of 1988 has in fact acknowledged this".

• (1710)

If we make reference to the specific provisions of the North American free trade agreement we see that the trade agreement is about reducing trade barriers to goods and services between parties or between nations. It goes on in article 22.01 to say that the goods of a party are identified as products as understood in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trades.

If we go a little further we see in looking at the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trades that the harmonized commodity coding system identifies as a good of a party tariff item 22.01. When we look at that long list of numeric codes we find article 22.01 actually being defined in the GATT as ordinary natural water of all kinds other than sea water.

Whether you look under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trades or the referenced agreement that is included both in the NAFTA and the FTA, there is water sitting there as article 22.01, ordinary natural water of all kinds other than sea water. There is no question about it. Water is definitely included as a good of trade in both the FTA and the NAFTA.

The point I have been making time and time again is that there is no specific provision to exclude the possibility of bulk water transport as they have excluded the possibility of the export of raw logs or the possibility of exporting unprocessed fish written into the North American trade agreement.

Despite any implementing legislation that may say otherwise, despite any federal water policy that may say otherwise, without a specific exclusion that would exempt water exports, the possibility of exporting Canada's water is made vulnerable under the provisions of both the free trade agreement and the proposed North American free trade agreement.

In summary we have a unique opportunity here with the call from the President of the United States for an environmental review to place in parallel agreements specific exclusions for the possibility of bulk export of water which would assist this—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The hon. member's time has expired.

Mr. Bill Domm (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for Science and Minister of State (Small Businesses and Tourism)): Mr. Speaker, water in its natural state is not covered by NAFTA. It is not covered by the free trade agreement, the GATT or any other trade agreement. Lakes and rivers are simply not goods or products any

more than are the fish swimming in them or the oil and gas trapped under them.

Trade agreements only cover water when water has entered into commerce as a product. Canada's growing exports of water products benefits from such coverage. There is absolutely nothing in the NAFTA or any other trade agreement that forces Canada to either exploit its water for commercial use or to export its water.

What is in the NAFTA is the right to restrict or prohibit the export of water products when necessary to safeguard the environment or to protect human, animal, plant life or health.

Canada's 1987 federal water policy prohibits large scale exports of water by interbasin transfer or diversion. Therefore since we do not engage in large scale exports of water in any form, the proportionality requirement would have no real impact on Canada. A proportion of zero is zero.

Under the NAFTA, U.S. and Mexican investors and service providers will be subject to the same domestic laws and regulations as Canadians. The NAFTA creates absolutely no new obligation or right for anyone to exploit or export water as a good.

Why did we not dispel any lingering doubt by simply exempting water from the agreement? The answer is plain. There is no exemption for water in NAFTA simply because it is not necessary to insert an exemption from obligations that do not exist.

To do so would throw into doubt whether obligations exist for other natural resources in their natural state such as trees on the ground where clearly no such obligation exists either.

• (1715)

The bottom line is that Canadian governments both now and under the NAFTA have the freedom of action required to regulate the exploitation of our water resources. Until it is exploited and entered into commerce as goods, water is not covered by the NAFTA or any other trade agreement.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. Brian L. Gardiner (Prince George—Bulkley Valley): Mr. Speaker, on March 16 of this year I rose in the House and asked the minister of health a question regarding the alleged extra billing that was being done by physicians and doctors in Prince George, British Columbia and other parts of that province.

The minister provided what I thought was a very instructive and good reply in that he acknowledged some awareness of the situation. He acknowledged that under the Canada Health Act the government does have an ability to move in this regard and that it was looking into the matter with the provincial government.

Following the March 16 intervention in the House I wrote to the minister to inquire further and he suggested in his letter that his staff was looking into the matter. More recently, he also mentioned that he has written to the B.C. minister of health, the Hon. Elizabeth Cull, to get information to determine from the department's point of view whether the extra billing was taking place.

Obviously some time has passed since that question. I would look forward to the answer tonight from the government to get an indication as to what further progress has been made in this area. I have consulted with and talked on the phone late yesterday with the staff in my constituency office in Prince George. I can tell the government that we are still getting phone calls and reports from people in Prince George alleging either extra billing or that people are being asked to pay for medical services up front.

I report that to the government. I am very interested to hear what the government has to say about this particular issue and what kind of progress has been made.

Mr. Bill Domm (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for Science and Minister of State (Small Businesses and Tourism)): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to respond to the questions brought before this House by the hon. member.

The Minister of National Health and Welfare is on record in this House as saying that he will enforce the Canada Health Act and impose dollar for dollar financial penalties on any province in which patients are being extra billed for necessary medical services.

The Canada Health Act recognizes that it is our provincial and territorial governments that are responsible for determining how our health care services are to be delivered and financed. The act does not give the federal minister the power to stop extra billing in any province or territory. However it does give the minister the authority to withhold a portion of federal transfer payments for health from the province in which the extra

billing is occurring. This reduction in federal contributions serves as a disincentive to the practice of extra billing.

The Canada Health Act defines extra billing as charges to a patient for an insured health service in an amount that exceeds the provincial health plan payment. The act requires the cash health transfer payment to the province to be reduced by an amount equal to the amount of the extra billing occurring in the province. In other words, for each dollar of extra billing a dollar is deducted. However we must be sure before we decide to withhold any transfer funds.

The minister is very concerned about the possibility of some British Columbia physicians charging extra fees for insured services. Such fees would leave patients having to pay out of their own pockets when they have already paid for health care services through their taxes.

The fees would also represent a financial barrier to some patients seeking or receiving needed medical care. This is something that goes against the principles upon which our health care system is based.

In conclusion, this government is opposed strongly to extra billing in principle and in practice. The minister is prepared to use his authority under the Canada Health Act and respond accordingly if any legitimate threat in the form of extra billing occurs.

That investigation to assure the hon. member is currently in process and it is the intent of the minister to deal with it in the way he sees fit in the event the member's claims are found to be true.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at ten o'clock a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

The House adjourned at 5.21 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, June 4, 1993

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

[*English*]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Madam Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed Bill S-15, an act to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act (sexual orientation), to which the concurrence of this House is desired.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

NUNAVUT LAND CLAIMS AGREEMENT ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

Hon. Thomas Siddon (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development) moved that Bill C-133, an act respecting an agreement between the Inuit of the Nunavut settlement area and Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee in the Human Resources envelope.

He said: Madam Speaker, I want to speak this morning to my hon. colleagues about Bill C-133, which would give effect to the Nunavut land claims agreement.

One of the happiest moments of my life as Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development occurred when I joined with the Prime Minister last Tuesday in Iqaluit to sign the Nunavut land claims agreement.

As a result of this agreement there is a new spirit of optimism and a new energy among the Inuit of the eastern Arctic region. I noted the applause of the hon. member for Nunatsiaq. We very much appreciate his support and enthusiastic participation at the event last week.

I was struck by the tears of happiness and joy by the elders who gathered at Inukshuk School in Iqaluit with the children and the people of the eastern Arctic to celebrate this historic signing.

As we listened to Susan Aglukark sing *O Canada* in Inuktitut we sensed the confidence, joy and pride, especially of the children, as they anticipated a new future relationship with all the people of Canada.

I am personally committed to ensuring implementation of the land claims agreement by guiding this bill through Parliament. I know I am supported in this process by the Prime Minister who has given his unflagging support to this project. He has shown exceptional vision and commitment in addressing aboriginal and northern issues, including the recognition of Nunavut. I am also supported by my cabinet colleagues, who have approved the Nunavut land claims agreement which we debate today.

• (1010)

I am supported by the Inuit of the eastern Arctic. Without their determination, without their commitment to settling this land claim, we would not have reached the critical stage we are at today.

Bill C-133 gives effect to the Nunavut land claims agreement to settle the land claim of the Tungavik Federation of Nunavut which represents Inuit in the eastern Arctic. This agreement, which has been pursued over a period of 17 years going back to 1976, was endorsed last November by 69 per cent of Inuit living in the settlement region, and of those who actually voted 85 per cent approved the land claims settlement. This is an overwhelming show of support and it sends an important message to this House of the commitment that the Inuit wish to make to be partners in Canada.

The TFN land claim is the largest in Canadian history. It encompasses approximately one-fifth of the entire Canadian land mass, an area of some two million square kilometres in the central and eastern Arctic as well as adjacent offshore areas. That is known as the settlement area but is not to be confused with the actual lands to be owned by the Inuit, which are approximately 20 per cent of that amount.

This area, as well as the adjacent offshore areas, is the traditional homeland and hunting grounds of some 17,500 Inuit. It is in this area of the eastern Arctic that their ancestors have lived for many thousands of years and in a remarkable way have persisted and survived on the Arctic tundra. Today they wish to continue to live with the freedom to guide and choose their own destiny within Canada.

The Nunavut land claims agreement ensures that the Nunavut region will always be home to the Inuit. It provides lasting protection for Inuit land-based interests as well as the rights and benefits that will enable them to pursue socio-economic development.

The agreement provides Inuit with ownership of more than 350,000 square kilometres of land in the settlement region out of the total area of two million square miles. On more than 10 per cent of the area they will own, the Inuit will also own the mineral rights. In the rest of Nunavut, Inuit will share in the management of wildlife and the environment and in the economic benefits of future development.

The land provisions of this agreement are extremely important not only for Inuit but for all Canadians. By replacing the legal uncertainty of aboriginal claim to title with clearly defined rights to lands and resources, by establishing certainty of ownership and the delineation of those boundaries and by clarifying the rights of natives and non-natives in the settlement region, the Nunavut land claims agreement will open up this huge area of Canada for future orderly development.

That will mean jobs for Canadians, including Inuit and other aboriginal and non-aboriginal peoples living and working in northern Canada and throughout Canada. It will mean additional wealth and prosperity for northerners and other Canadians as we replace uncertainty with a stable and predictable economic and legal framework.

The Nunavut land claims agreement will bring enormous benefits to the north in the form of new investment, an improved standard of living and a brighter outlook for the youth of the region.

The agreement also includes significant financial benefits for Inuit of the settlement region. Over the next 14 years capital payments totalling $580 million in 1989 dollars will be made to the Nunavut trust, which will manage the money for the benefit of Inuit.

• (1015)

I should indicate that in comparison, the government through the programs of financial assistance to Inuit is presently spending hundreds of millions of dollars to support the eastern Arctic. We want to replace welfare with self-reliance. That is the purpose of this settlement payment and the land base and the accompanying public government which we will speak of when we debate Bill C-132 later today.

The Nunavut land claims agreement foresees the day when resource developments will generate significant revenues in the settlement region.

Inuit interests are well protected in that each year they will receive 50 per cent of the first $2 million in royalties paid to the government on any resource development for which royalties accrue within the Nunavut area. They will receive 5 per cent of all royalties in excess of $2 million on the public lands which are outside of land owned by the Inuit.

This agreement is about much more than land ownership and capital transfers. It is about acknowledging the special needs of the Inuit. It is about protecting their traditional lifestyles and pursuits.

One of those needs is employment training. To ensure that the Inuit can play a full and meaningful role in the institutions of government and in the private sector economic initiatives, a $13 million training trust fund is to be established under this agreement.

It is a great misfortune that much of the work done in the administration of projects in the eastern Arctic is done by southerners, non-Inuit. We want to make a visible change to provide much greater opportunity for Inuit to be involved in the architecture and production of their own destiny.

As well, Inuit employment by government will be increased. Firms owned by Inuit will be assisted in competing for government contracts.

As hon. members know, a common feature of land claim settlements is to guarantee the aboriginal claimant group a central role in wildlife management. The Nunavut land claims agreement is no exception. Inuit will have equal representation on a board that will be established to oversee wildlife harvesting in the settlement region.

Inuit will be guaranteed specific wildlife harvesting rights, including the right to harvest their basic needs as they have for thousands of years. Inuit will also have economic opportunities related to guiding, sports lodges and the commercial marketing of wildlife resources.

The Inuit of the eastern Arctic are perhaps more dependent on traditional pursuits than any other group of aboriginal people in Canada. Therefore, the agreement recognizes this dependence and safeguards Inuit interests.

Inuit will be entitled to compensation where developers cause provable damage to property or equipment used in harvesting wildlife. They will also be compensated when development projects cause loss of harvesting income or loss of wildlife harvested for personal use.

In addition to their role in wildlife management, the agreement ensures equal Inuit participation on boards responsible for land use planning, environmental and socio-economic reviews of development projects and water management.

Finally, I am pleased to inform hon. members that the Nunavut land claims agreement will help the government achieve one of its key green plan objectives. That is to complete Canada's system of national parks. Following consultations with Inuit and other local residents, at least three national parks, one in each of the three regions of Nunavut, will be established in the settlement region within four years of proclamation of this agreement.

• (1020)

I want to emphasize that the Nunavut land claims agreement and Bill C-133 which will implement it do not affect or diminish any rights of other aboriginal peoples guaranteed under section 35 of the Constitution Act. In fact, the final agreement explicitly protects the traditional livelihood and hunting activities of all other aboriginal groups on lands within the Nunavut settlement area. This was a key objective of the government.

As a sign of their commitment to accommodate the interests of other aboriginal groups, the Nunavut Inuit have negotiated overlap agreements with the Inuvialuit in the western Arctic and the Inuit of northern Quebec. Negotiations are also proceeding with the Sahtu Dene-Métis in the western Arctic.

We are pleased that similar agreements have now been negotiated with the Dene of northern Saskatchewan and Manitoba, who also claim traditional use of certain lands north of the 60th parallel.

I remind hon. members that the Federal Court has ruled that the Nunavut land claims agreement protects any interests that the Saskatchewan and Manitoba Dene bands may have in the Nunavut settlement area. In fact this agreement may even give them legal rights they do not currently enjoy under treaty. Thus the Manitoba and Saskatchewan bands have agreed that they will not oppose ratification of this agreement. I compliment the hon. members who helped to facilitate that agreement.

Article 4 is a key element of the Nunavut land claims agreement. It requires the Governments of Canada and the Northwest Territories and the Tungavik Federation of Nunavut to negotiate a political accord to divide the Northwest Territories into two parts and to establish a new territorial government, a public government, in the eastern Arctic.

In this way Bill C-133 will lay the foundation for a new partnership between Inuit and Canada in the creation of Nunavut. It will enable a proud and self-reliant group of aboriginal Canadians to achieve long sought economic and political goals in the north.

It builds on the traditions and culture of the elders whose ancestors survived in that Arctic barren land for so many thousands of years. Yet this agreement passes on a lasting legacy to the children of the Inuit of generations to come.

It will guarantee Inuit a land base and give them the means and the rights to continue traditional pursuits that are at the very heart of their culture and to do it in harmony with all other Canadians.

Therefore, I urge all of my hon colleagues to give this bill their firm and decisive support. In that sense, Madam Speaker, I think you will find consent to move through all stages of Bill C-133 today, including Committee of the Whole, so that we might complete consideration of this bill.

This debate is being witnessed by Inuit members of the executive of the Tungavik Federation of Nunavut and others. They dearly hope that the members of Parliament will show the commitment they seek from us today.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: No.

Madam Deputy Speaker: I asked for unanimous consent and it has not been given.

ALLOCATION OF TIME

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, there have been discussions among the parties and under the provisions of Standing Order 78(1), I move:

> That, in relation to today's consideration of Bill C-133, an act respecting an agreement between the Inuit of the Nunavut settlement area and Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada, one hour and 45 minutes be allotted to the consideration of all stages of the bill, including committee of the whole;
>
> That, notwithstanding Standing Order 45(6), any recorded division requested shall be taken immediately;
>
> That, notwithstanding Standing Order 24, the House shall sit beyond the hour of daily adjournment, if necessary, to complete all stages of the bill;
>
> That, at expiry of the time provided for this order, any proceedings before the House shall be interrupted, if required, for the purpose of this order and, in turn, every question necessary to dispose of the remaining stages of the bill shall be put forthwith and successively, without further debate or amendment.

• (1025)

Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan): Madam Speaker, as the House knows my caucus has not supported time allocation in the House. We have opposed it in the past because it tends to be a unilateral action by the government of the day.

On this unique occasion we are supportive of the motion the government House leader has just put forward. This is not a unilateral action; this is a collective action on behalf of the people of Canada. They support it. We support it.

Mr. John Manley (Ottawa South): Madam Speaker, I would also like to indicate on behalf of our party that we were consulted.

I agree with the comments of the New Democratic Party Whip that this is not a unilateral action on the part of the government. We support this motion giving effect to the legislation under discussion.

Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River): Madam Speaker, I would like to make note that it is not so much a matter of the content of this particular legislation we have a problem with. It is the process in the Chamber.

We have not been consulted on the process. We see a process in place here such as we saw earlier with the New Brunswick legislation where something slides through quickly on the last Friday of a parliamentary session.

What I would like to say is that we have a problem with the process. Although I would like to congratulate the Inuit who are here today, we see that the government is able to put just anything through.

Madam Deputy Speaker: We are getting into debate at this point. The motion the minister has put to the House under Standing Order 78(1) forbids debate.

If there is agreement among the parties, under Standing Order 78(1) I will now put the question. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: No.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

An hon. member: Nay.

Madam Deputy Speaker: The motion is carried on division.

Motion agreed to.

MEASURE TO ENACT

Mr. Jack Iyerak Anawak (Nunatsiaq):

[*Editor's Note: Member spoke in Inuktitut, translated as follows:*]

[*Translation*]

It is a great honour and privilege for me to speak today on the Nunavut bills, the bills to ratify the Nunavut land claim agreement and to establish the new territory of Nunavut. Both bills before us impact profoundly on the future of Canada's north and Canada as a whole. Both these bills change the course of history. Canada is evolving and the Inuit of Nunavut are in the forefront of that evolution.

[*English*]

Madam Deputy Speaker: For the benefit of hon. members, there is English translation on channel five and there is someone translating from English to French so that all members can understand what the member is saying in Inuktitut on this very special day.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Anawak: This is a momentous and proud occasion for the Inuit of Nunavut. For me it is also very special for another reason. Today I am speaking both as a member of Parliament for the region concerned and as a beneficiary of the Nunavut land claim agreement.

I do not believe such a set of circumstances has occurred before in the House. This is a first, and for me this is a humbling experience.

• (1030)

[*English*]

For the Inuit the settlement of the land claim and the creation of Nunavut represent a bold new start and a chance to participate as partners in the development of our homeland and our country. Underlying everything is the hope of a better future for our children.

[*Translation*]

The land claim and the establishment of Nunavut are basic expressions of Inuit self-determination. For too long Inuit have been left out of the major economic and political decision-making process affecting our lives. Through the land claim agreement and Nunavut we are re-establishing some control over our own affairs. We are also ensuring the preservation and enhancement of our identity as distinct peoples: our culture, our language and our way of life.

Later today I will have more to say about the meaning of Nunavut when we deal with the bill to establish Nunavut.

[*English*]

The bill before us now, Bill C-133, is the land claim ratification bill. It is difficult, however, to talk about the land claim without talking about Nunavut because the two are inseparably linked.

Inuit have always tied the establishment of Nunavut to the settlement of the land claim. Obtaining a commitment to the territory of Nunavut was a fundamental component of the Inuit land claim negotiations from the beginning. It was in fact a prerequisite for the settlement of the land claim.

Bear with me while I continue in French.

[*Translation*]

What we are doing today is very important for all of Canada. The bill concerning the territory of Nunavut, which is connected with our claim, will confirm through legislation federal recognition of the new territory. However, hon. members and Canadians should realize that Nunavut already exists and has always existed in the minds and hearts of the Inuit. We know that Nunavut is our land.

We want to thank Canada for recognizing our rights and our desire to take control of our destiny and of our territory and help create a stronger Canada.

[*Translation*]

To continue in Inuktitut, I want to congratulate the Inuit of Nunavut for their achievement and thank those who represented them at the negotiating table throughout the years for their hard work, their determination, and for all the sacrifices they and their families made.

Many of the individuals involved were present at the formal signing of the land claim agreement in Iqaluit on May 25, but there were others who for a variety of reasons were not in Iqaluit on that day. I would like to take a moment to acknowledge the contributions made by so many.

Thanks are due to current and past negotiators, board members and staff of the Tungavik Federation of Nunavut and the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada: Paul Quassa, James Eetoolook, John Amagoalik, James Arvaluk, Tagak Curley, Perer Ernerk, Donat Milortuk, Bob Kadlun, Jack Kupeuna, David Aglukark, Louis Tapardjuk, Mark Evaluardjuk, Louis Pilakapsi, Thomas Suluk, Simon Taipana, John Maksagak, Peter Ittinuar and Kane Tologanak.

I could go on and on and still probably leave someone out inadvertently. If I have I apologize.

I also want to recognize the contributions of the elders such as Peter Kaminguak and Abe Ookpik and those who are no longer with us.

• (1035)

[*English*]

The history of this land claim goes back many years. It spans several federal governments and numerous ministers of Indian and northern affairs. Very few people realize that prior to 1973 the Government of Canada did not have a policy to negotiate land claims. It was the current Leader of the Official Opposition, under whom I am proud to serve, who, when he was the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, brought forward the first policy to negotiate and resolve land claims.

In 1975 the Inuit of Nunavik achieved the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement. The following year, in 1976, the Inuit of the Northwest Territories, as represented by the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada, presented their land claim to the federal government for negotiation. Their submission included the proposal for the creation of the Nunavut territory.

The claim proposal was subsequently revised in 1977. In that same year, the Inuvialuit of the western Arctic filed their own land claim. In 1978 they signed an agreement in principle with the federal government and the final agreement was reached in 1984. Between 1976 and 1979 the Inuit of the central and eastern Arctic experienced difficulty with their negotiations. There was an impasse over dealing with Nunavut at the land claim table.

In 1980 a breakthrough was achieved. Agreement was reached to deal with the Inuit proposals on Nunavut through a political development process in the Northwest Territories separate from but parallel with the land claims negotiations. In 1982 the Tungavik Federation of Nunavut was formed for the specific purpose of negotiating the Inuit land claim.

In April 1990 an agreement in principle was reached. Article 4 of that agreement in principle affirmed federal, territorial and Inuit support for the creation of Nunavut as soon as possible. In December 1991 negotiations were finalized on outstanding items in the land claims, including the creation of Nunavut. In November 1992 the Inuit of Nunavut voted to ratify their land claim agreement.

• (1040)

[*Translation*]

It has been a long journey filled with many rough spots and roadblocks. I want to focus now on the actual land claim and some of the obstacles Inuit encountered in their negotiations with the government. From the beginning the government set out all kinds of preconditions and restrictions. In return the Inuit were more than generous.

Some of the comments I am about to make I have made on other occasions over the past several years and many of the people watching or listening today will be familiar with them. However, I feel I must restate them for the record.

[*English*]

First I want to take issue with the term "land claim ". It is highly inappropriate. I wish there were a better term to use but I will try to describe what I mean by inappropriate.

When aboriginal peoples talk about their lands, we are talking about our homelands. We are talking about the territories and resources upon which our people have survived for thousands of years. We are talking first and foremost about our cultures and our way of life on these territories. The land, the waters, the wildlife and we, the people, are one and the same. We are not separate from our environment. We are part of it and it is part of us.

Yet non-aboriginal governments have looked upon land claim negotiations as real estate transactions. This is not our view. It is difficult for us to understand the non-aboriginal concept of individual land title and ownership.

[*Translation*]

We see these negotiations primarily as the means to preserve our relationship with the land and ensure our survival as peoples in the larger society surrounding us. Therefore we are also talking about economic and political power. We require the economic and political means to control what happens on our lands.

In claim negotiations aboriginal peoples are not seeking something that someone else already owns. We dispute that implication. We are not asking the government to give us anything that does not belong to us. We are only seeking recognition of what is rightfully ours. We are trying to take back what was taken away from us by governments without our consent in the past.

We are reasonable peoples. We have always been willing to share our lands and resources. We recognize that all peoples and all governments must work together for the benefit of all. This is why Inuit and other aboriginal peoples have entered into land claim negotiations.

[*English*]

We start from the premise that we are the rightful occupants and owners of the land. The government should be asking us for permission to occupy our lands and use our resources and should negotiate with us on that basis. Instead the government takes the position that it owns the land and it believes it is being generous by sharing some of our land with us.

[*Translation*]

The government has never even admitted that the Inuit have aboriginal title to Nunavut. The preamble of the Nunavut claim bill begins with the following statement:

• (1045)

[*English*]

> Whereas the Inuit of the Nunavut settlement area have asserted an aboriginal title to that area based on their traditional and current use and occupation of the lands, waters and land-fast ice therein in accordance with their own customs and usages;

I want to say for the record that Inuit do not just assert title to Nunavut. Our title is real. It is the Government of Canada that has asserted title to Nunavut. Our title predates any claim by the government whether the government recognizes it or not.

[*Translation*]

The government would not be negotiating land settlements with us and with other aboriginal people if it did not believe we had aboriginal rights and title. I do not know why the government refuses to acknowledge this.

[*English*]

I also cannot discuss this land claims settlement without repeating my objection to the extinguishment clause. The clause appears in the Certainty Section of the claim agreement as clause 2.7.1:

> In consideration of the rights and benefits provided to Inuit by the Agreement, Inuit hereby:
>
> (a) cede, release and surrender to Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, all their aboriginal claims, rights, title and interests, if any, in and to lands and waters anywhere within Canada and adjacent offshore areas within the sovereignty or jurisdiction of Canada; and
>
> (b) agree, on their behalf, and on behalf of their heirs, descendants and successors not to assert any cause of action, action for a declaration, claim or demand of whatever kind or nature which they ever had, now have or may hereafter have against Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada or any province, the government of any territory or any person based on any aboriginal claims, rights, title or interests in and to lands and waters described in Sub-section (a).

I repeat the words: "if any" from part (a).

This comprehensive extinguishment of rights was a government demand and condition for settlement. Inuit did not and do not want to extinguish their rights but this was the price the government asked us to pay.

[*Translation*]

The government made sure it exacted a heavy price for rights that it was not even sure we had. It did so in the name of certainty.

This land claim settlement is a good deal for the Government of Canada in another way. There is a perception that Inuit are getting the bulk of the land they claimed. That is not the case.

[*English*]

It is true that this is the largest land claim settlement in Canada but this is because the Northwest Territories represents about one-third of Canada and the area claimed by Inuit covers a large portion of it.

The Inuit claim encompasses two million square kilometres within the Northwest Territories. Under the land claims settlement, Inuit will have surface title to 350,000 square kilometres. Inuit will have subsurface title to about 36,000 square kilometres within the 350,000 square kilometres.

What this means is that the Government of Canada is getting title to about 82 per cent of the land claimed. Inuit are getting title to about 18 per cent of the total area claimed. If we look at the area to which Inuit are getting subsurface title, the percentage drops to about 2 per cent.

[*Translation*]

The government ended up with so much land because it set preconditions at the outset. The government said the Inuit could only have a certain amount of land in total. Inuit were prohibited from from making land selections in certain specific areas. The government had the power to do this because it was bigger and stronger.

• (1050)

[*English*]

Canadians should understand the tremendous power imbalance that exists in land claim negotiations between aboriginal peoples and the federal government. The federal government makes the rules. It changes the rules. It breaks the rules. It has the money and all kinds of high-powered expertise at its disposal. It has armies of bureaucrats and relies on legalese.

Aboriginal negotiators do not have the same resources. They are also communicating with government representatives in a language that is not in their mother tongue, and then they have to try to explain to their people government terms and concepts that simply do not exist in aboriginal languages. In addition, there are totally different decision-making processes involved.

While some revisions to policies and practices have been made from time to time, the system and the policies are still heavily weighted in the federal government's favour.

There are other matters in this agreement that continue to cause me some concern.

[*Translation*]

I still think $580 million is a small price for the government to pay for the extinguishment of Inuit rights and for 82 per cent of our territory. Nevertheless that sum could be of significant benefit if invested wisely. We will have to be very vigilant and cautious.

I am also worried about the number of boards and institutions that will be set up under this claim. We are headed into a very complex system of administration and I hope we do not find ourselves overwhelmed and overburdened.

I also want to touch briefly on implementation. Previous claim settlements, the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement and the Western Arctic Inuvialuit Agreement have experienced serious implementation problems. Since an entire section of the Nunavut claim agreement is devoted to implementation, we hope to avoid the implementation problems of the past.

[*English*]

In this context I want to urge the government to be forever mindful of the spirit and intent behind this agreement.

[*Translation*]

As I said earlier, what Inuit have tried to obtain in this agreement is a better future for our children. The right to harvest wildlife on lands and waters throughout Nunavut is a major component of this agreement. In addition, Inuit will have equal membership with governments on institutions established to manage the land, water, offshore and wildlife of Nunavut and to evaluate the impact of development projects on the environment.

As well, Inuit will get a share of the royalties the federal government receives from oil, gas and mineral development on Crown lands. On lands where Inuit have surface title, Inuit will be able to negotiate with industry for economic and social benefits from non-renewable development.

[*Translation*]

The agreement also specifies an amount of $13 million for a training trust fund and includes measures to increase Inuit employment within government and to increase access to government contracts.

[*English*]

There is much promise here. There are opportunities to be seized. There are challenges to be faced.

[*Translation*]

This agreement must benefit all us Inuit. This agreement is for us. We must make it work for all. We must never forget the people in the communities.

We must focus on our education and training needs. We must encourage and support our youth so that we can benefit from their talents and energies. We must integrate the wisdom of our elders. Together with the co-operation of government and all the people of Nunavut we will utilize this agreement to build the better future we envision.

[*English*]

I would like to complete my remarks by acknowledging again the support and hard work of the people of the Tungavik Federation of Nunavut and the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada, as well the countless number of people who have had to endure a lot of travel time or being away from their families. They spent a lot of time not quite knowing what was going to happen next but they always had the intent to get the best deal for the Inuit of Nunavut.

With that I am very confident that the Inuit of Nunavut have embarked on a future that will be beneficial not only to the Inuit but to the people of Canada.

Mr. Skelly (Comox—Alberni): Madam Speaker, a point of order. You will note there is only about three minutes remaining until Question Period.

It is very difficult to put a speech forward in that period of time. I wonder if the House would consider suspending debate for three minutes so that we can go through Question Period and then I can make my presentation.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Madam Deputy Speaker: Does the House agree that I should suspend the House until 11 a.m.?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Madam Deputy Speaker: A very short suspension.

The sitting of the House was suspended at 10.57 a.m.

SITTING RESUMED

The House resumed at 11 a.m.

Madam Deputy Speaker: The House will now proceed to Statements by Members pursuant to Standing Order 31.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 31

[*English*]

MEDICARE

Mr. Howard Crosby (Halifax West): Madam Speaker, is medicare in serious trouble in Canada? If it is then sacrificing physicians, especially young doctors, will not solve the problems.

Ontario's NDP government proposes to reduce payments to entry physicians to a level that will drive them out of the province and very probably out of the country. Even worse, there could be a chain reaction affecting other provinces.

An enormous public investment is made in every medical school graduate. The national benefit is a medical profession that is second to none in the world and the heart of Canadian medicare. If we allow government policy to undermine entry physicians, we will lose a whole generation of the best and brightest among young Canadians, a group that includes the future Bantings, Bests and Penfields.

I urge the minister of health to intervene, not just to aid young physicians but to preserve a Canadian medical service that has taken more than a century to establish and develop.

* * *

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mrs. Beryl Gaffney (Nepean): Madam Speaker, four years ago today the world watched in horror as Chinese government troops opened fire on thousands of democracy campaigners in Tiananmen Square. Yet four short years later the present Canadian government seems to be indicating that it has forgotten the atrocities.

Recently the vice-premier of China, who is acting premier and one of the highest ranking members of the Chinese government, was invited to Canada not by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, who was frozen out of the meetings, but by the Minister for International Trade. Incredibly, in his speech welcoming the vice-premier, the minister of trade never once mentioned human rights. This is typical of the importance accorded human rights by this government which sees human rights as a minor irritant.

I understand the importance of trade. However there has to be a better understanding of the link between trade and human rights, particularly given that a month from now the world will be meeting in Vienna at a human rights conference, a conference at which China will be opposing any strengthening of human rights standards and mechanisms.

As a nation we should be saying to the business community that we will stand behind it if it ties trade to human rights. Reebok and Sears, Roebuck are to be commended for their efforts in this regard.

* * *

SERVICE INDUSTRIES

Mr. Girve Fretz (Erie): Madam Speaker, are Canadian businesses, including those in the service sector, trying harder? Recessions are painful for those who lose jobs and for business owners.

However, as a result Canadians have become more competitive, more productive and more service oriented. While our exports continue to surge to new records monthly, something else seems to be occurring on the home front. Businesses are offering greater warranties and guarantees and service has become the watchword of the day.

My congratulations to all involved in service industries, in wholesale and retail, and in manufacturing. They provide jobs for millions of Canadians. It is the result of their vision, their initiative and their industry that Canadians enjoy one of the highest standards of living in the world.

* * *

YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT

Mr. Jim Karygiannis (Scarborough—Agincourt): Madam Speaker, I will be rising later today to present a petition containing approximately 5,000 names which were gathered by two residents of Scarborough, Mr. and Mrs. Crawford, who are with us today in the gallery.

This petition, which calls for strengthening the provisions in the Young Offenders Act, came about after the son of Mr. and Mrs. Crawford was viciously murdered in a Scarborough storm sewer by three young offenders. Crimes such as this must not be dealt with in a superficial way. Changes are needed in the legislation and needed today.

Canadians from every corner of the country have called for changes for many years now and this government has failed on all accounts. I would like to call on the government, which indicated in the House on Wednesday that it might table a white paper on the Young Offenders Act, to stop its delaying tactics and use what time is left in the life of the session to table sensitive changes to the YOA. Failing this, I ask it to set up a public inquiry over the summer to let the people of this country have the opportunity to express their concerns over this flawed act.

The time for change is now.

* * *

MICHAEL HO

Mr. Bruce Halliday (Oxford): Madam Speaker, this being National Access Awareness Week, in which you have shown special interest, I am pleased to rise today on behalf of the hon. member for Calgary West, as well as the members of the Standing Committee on Human Rights and the Status of Disabled Persons, to recognize the recipient of the 1993-94 Centennial Flame Research Award, Mr. Michael Ho of Calgary, who is visiting us in Ottawa today. This award is funded by the coins thrown into the Centennial flame fountain.

• (1105)

Mr. Ho, a lawyer who because of a head injury is no longer able to practise, has been active in organizations providing services to individuals with head injuries including the Head Injury Association of Alberta.

He is proposing to research the success stories of survivors of head injuries to serve as guiding lights for people dealing with this type of disability.

The main subject of his study will be Laurie Cormack, who not only experienced a head injury but has struggled with the trauma of being a battered wife.

It should also be recognized that Mr. Ho's contribution to Canada was acknowledged when he received the Canada 125 Award in 1992, as well as a personal testimonial from the Prime Minister which he received in 1989.

Congratulations are in order for Mr. Ho who is an inspiration to his fellow citizens.

* * *

MINISTER OF THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Brian L. Gardiner (Prince George—Bulkley Valley): Madam Speaker, concerns have arisen about the Minister of the Environment and his performance in office. Under legislation that creates the Department of the Environment, the minister is given responsibility to promote and encourage practices and conduct that lead to the preservation and enhancement of environmental quality.

Where was the minister when cabinet acted to accept the Kemano project, an action recently declared illegal by a Senate-Commons committee? Where is the minister on other pressing environmental concerns addressed at Rio a year ago?

I agree that the minister should come under closer scrutiny, closer scrutiny for failing to protect our precious environmental resources, in particular our water resources.

* * *

TAXATION

Mr. John Reimer (Kitchener): Madam Speaker, as the Ontario government concludes its social contract talks and is looking for ways to reduce its deficit, it is sadly missing a very simple action it could take.

According to Ontario government treasury figures it would realize a net gain of $500 million if it harmonized the provincial sales tax with the goods and services tax. That represents 25 per cent of the money it is looking to save through the social contract talks.

Second, according to federal finance department figures, Ontario businesses would stand to gain a net benefit of between $2.1 billion and $2.3 billion in 1992-93 figures. This money could be used for investment and job creation rather than losing it to time required to administer two separate sales tax systems.

The Canadian Federation of Independent Business strongly endorses one harmonized system because of lower compliance costs to business in Ontario.

Rather than practising crass politics the premier should harmonize the sales tax system for the benefit of the people of Ontario—

Madam Deputy Speaker: I am sorry but the member's time has expired.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Gilbert Parent (Welland—St. Catharines—Thorold): Madam Speaker, Statistics Canada has released some numbers on unemployment today. My riding has the highest unemployment rate of the province of Ontario, well over 13 per cent, and places among the top unemployed centres in Canada.

No matter what the OECD says, it is obvious that Canada is still in a recession. The statement made by OECD that our country is on the upswing offers cold comfort for my constituents looking for a job and, at times, looking for the next meal.

The government could help us in our riding through funding of the Peter Street bridge in Thorold. If we lose the bridge through inaction or lack of help from the St. Lawrence seaway, it will mean greater loss of jobs for us, not only for the city of Thorold but for the riding. The loss of the bridge would substantially affect the dollars we need from tourism, and that is not to mention the safety factor.

I urge the government to pay immediate attention to my riding by giving us very desperately needed funds and helping us create new jobs.

* * *

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

Mr. Ray Funk (Prince Albert—Churchill River): Madam Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Agriculture kicked the legs out from under the Canadian Wheat Board and the co-operative grain marketing system.

By unilaterally opening a continental market for barley, the minister is threatening the work of four

generations of farmers to use democracy and mutual self-help to improve their position in the market.

It gives me pleasure today to announce that it remains the position of the New Democratic Party to fully reinstate barley under the Canadian Wheat Board Act.

We know where the government stands. I would like to challenge the Liberal Party to make its position crystal clear as well.

Why is the minister doing it now? By making his announcement in the middle of the Alberta election campaign, he is clearly signalling that a few votes in southern Alberta are more important than maintaining the most successful grain marketing system in the world.

* * *

CASH FLOW ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM

Mr. Bob Porter (Medicine Hat): Madam Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Agriculture announced that the Cash Flow Enhancement Program has been extended to the 1993-94 crop year. The cash flow program will provide low interest cash advances on crops farmers have produced but not yet sold.

• (1110)

For the 1993-94 crop year the federal government and farmers will share interest costs on cash advances of up to $60,000. The previous program provided cash advances of up to $50,000. Increasing the cap from $50,000 to $60,000 will help farmers and corn growers with high carry-over from last year's crop. Horticulture and row crop producers who traditionally take out larger advances will also benefit from the increased cap.

This announcement in advance of the crop year will help producers plan cash flow requirements for this year's harvest. This program, with a cost of $32 million to the government, will direct up to $1 billion to the farm sector this fall.

Despite cuts in the federal budget, programs designed to stabilize farm income have been protected.

* * *

[*Translation*]

FISHERIES

Mr. Douglas Young (Acadie—Bathurst): Madam Speaker, the fisheries in northeastern New Brunswick are in dire straits. The compensation and training program announced by the federal government is not even-handed and fails to meet the expectations of an industry that has been severely affected by the reduced quotas for groundfish.

The sit-in at the offices of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans in Tracadie-Sheila is one more symptom of the desperation and frustration of the plant workers and fishermen of Acadie—Bathurst. I understand why the fish plant workers in my region feel powerless and discouraged. They can only look forward to another year without a hope of finding decent jobs because, once again, there has been a lack of planning on the part of Fisheries and Oceans and Employment and Immigration.

I urge the Government of Canada to announce, as soon as possible, programs to help all workers affected by a situation that has become intolerable.

* * *

[*English*]

861 SILVERFOX SQUADRON

Mr. Ross Belsher (Fraser Valley East): Madam Speaker, I would like to congratulate the young people involved in 861 Silverfox Squadron of the Royal Canadian Air Cadets.

I had the pleasure last Saturday of attending the Silverfox Squadron's fifteenth annual inspection at the Matsqui-Abbotsford recreational centre. It was an enjoyable afternoon as the cadets of 861 squadron presented a number of demonstrations for the crowd in attendance. The marching band deserves special recognition for an excellent performance.

I also want to note specifically the squadron's commanding officer, Captain Ian Anderson, for his efforts. He has a large responsibility in guiding the training and recreational activities of the cadets under him. In the process these cadets are improving their own skills and positively contributing to our community.

Again, well done and congratulations to 861 Silverfox Squadron of Abbotsford and Matsqui.

* * *

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Vic Althouse (Mackenzie): Madam Speaker, according to the treaties signed with Indian peoples, status Indians must have suitable housing, modern education and health care equivalent to that available in Canadian society. Populations on Indian lands are growing. In Saskatchewan that population doubles every 20 years. Therefore housing becomes an urgent need.

There are bands in my riding that have a housing backlog of more than 20 units but no funds are available from the federal government, so band members have to move off reserve. What happens then? By the refusal of the federal government to live up to the treaty right for shelter, the Conservatives are forcing band members off the reserve who then become the financial responsibility of the province's welfare system.

The federal government is saving twice by not providing housing and by forcing provinces to pay sustenance costs through their welfare systems. This is cheating. The government should be ashamed.

* * *

[*Translation*]

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. Mark Assad (Gatineau—La Lièvre): Madam Speaker, the effects of unemployment are becoming increasingly widespread from year to year. The higher unemployment rate experienced by regions like Chicoutimi–Jonquière, which at 16 per cent has the highest rate in Quebec, followed by Trois-Rivières, Montreal and Sherbrooke, confirms the failure of the policies of the Conservative government that will not recognize the destructive impact of the free trade agreement it negotiated.

Although media reports mentioned a recovery in the manufacturing sector, we see that in Quebec, unemployment continues to rise in this sector. The lack of programs to help industries through the transition during the past four years is a sign of the weakness of this government. The negative impact of free trade, combined with a lack of training in technological skills and the increased tax burden on the middle class, have not only further weakened the Canadian economy but also led to the creation of an underground economy, unfortunately.

* * *

[*English*]

CHILDREN

Mr. Dave Worthy (Cariboo—Chilcotin): Madam Speaker, people who I represent have always expressed concern for law and order issues. However recently there has been a dramatic increase in their communications to me in regard to two issues that are now before us in this House. One issue of course is child pornography. The other issue relates to child abuse. I have been overwhelmed by their support for these pieces of legislation.

• (1115)

To date I have heard from over 1,000 people living in my riding, from the communities of Williams Lake, Quesnel, 100 Mile House, Alexis Creek. The list of communities goes on. This legislation is seen by them as a commitment to the children of Canada. The people I represent want to see this commitment embedded in the Criminal Code.

They have asked me to express to all members in the House the importance of ensuring that these issues receive our careful attention. Therefore, when we rise for the summer it will be with the knowledge that Canadian children will be better protected.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

EMPLOYMENT

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Acting Prime Minister.

This government has one week left and all we are hearing from the leadership candidates is what a great economic job it has done. What a joke.

At the time of the last election there were one million Canadians looking for work. Today there are 1.6 million Canadians who do not have jobs. Since the last election the unemployment rate has shot up by 60 per cent.

There are 41,000 jobless in Hamilton and more to come, thanks to this government's ridiculous trade policies. There are 45,000 jobless in Calgary. Almost 500,000 people in Toronto are looking for work.

How can the government say it is on the right economic track when so many more people are hurting today?

Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Finance and Privatization)): Madam Speaker, I want to draw to the hon. member's attention the good economic news that is coming out daily.

For example, sales are up dramatically for our domestic auto makers. Just yesterday General Motors announced a third shift and that 650 more workers are to be hired. The figures for Chrysler, the company that builds its cars in Brampton, Ontario, rose 16.1 per cent. The figures for trucks are up 15.3 per cent and for cars, 17 per cent. These domestic auto makers are doing extremely well.

Capacity utilization is up strongly in our manufacturing area. Statistics Canada attributes that to our strong exports.

For the hon. member to stand up and blame the woes on the free trade agreement or other things is totally wrong.

What is happening is that the economy is recovering from a very serious recession and the recovery is very slow. However the signs are now there. Canada is going to come out of this recession much stronger than all the other OECD countries. This was just expressed this week by the OECD. It is the strongest growth not only in economic terms but in employment terms as well.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Madam Speaker, I am surprised the minister can afford to brag about a 60 per cent increase in unemployment since the last election. We are talking about 1,600,000 Canadians who are out of work. In Montreal, 80,000 jobs were lost just since the last election. In Toronto, 150,000 more jobs were lost. How can the minister say he is doing a good job when the government knows that the employment figures and statistics tell an entirely different story?

[*English*]

Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Finance and Privatization)): Madam Speaker, the hon. member failed to mention that since our government was elected, 1.3 million more people are working today than there were back in 1984. That was a slight oversight, I am sure, by my hon. friend.

I think the hon. member fails to recognize or refer to the fact that we have come through a very serious recessionary period in that period of time. The hon. member knows because when her party was the Government of Canada it experienced the same problem, that in recessionary periods there is the problem of high unemployment. That happens.

What we have been able to accomplish is to get interest rates and inflation down and to get Canada positioned to take advantage of the growth we are going to experience both this year and next. Jobs will follow with that growth.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Madam Speaker, I was in the House four years ago when the Minister of Finance announced he was going to bring about a recession in Canada. I was also here when both Tory leadership candidates fully supported the policies of that same minister.

He was talking about jobs, so I will ask him why, in one month, we lost 78 full-time jobs? Part-time jobs at a fast food outlet are fine, but when will we have a policy for creating full-time jobs that will pay Canadians a decent wage?

• (1120)

[*English*]

Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Finance and Privatization)): Madam Speaker, I could go through the list of companies that in the last few weeks have talked about increasing employment. That includes General Motors to which I just referred with 650 additional jobs in Oshawa. Other firms are making those announcements.

I might also say that the help wanted index—

Ms. Copps: How many did they lay off this month?

Mr. McDermid: The hon. member is not listening to the answer. She is yapping away there as she usually does. She delivers her best speech from the seat of her pants—

Madam Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for York North.

Mr. Maurizio Bevilacqua (York North): Madam Speaker, according to Statistics Canada the unemployment rate is stuck at 11.4 per cent. That is unchanged from last month and is higher than the month before.

The Minister of Finance must agree that unemployment in this country is a serious problem. He must also agree that it is draining the energy from our economy, hurting consumer confidence and hampering the recovery.

Canadians want opportunities. Canadians want to get back to work. Why does the government continue with trickle down economics, the hands off, do nothing approach when there are millions of Canadians looking for opportunities. They are eager to put the Canadian economy back on its feet.

Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Finance and Privatization)): Madam Speaker, I agree with the hon. member that unemployment is unacceptably high. It is unacceptably high in other countries as well. The OECD ministers of finance and international trade discussed that this week at the OECD meeting. There is no disagreement on that.

The Liberal Party's idea of boosting employment is to take money and throw it at part-time, make-work projects. That is that party's policy. It has a policy where it wants the federal, provincial and municipal governments to borrow this money and throw it at part-time work to provide 10,000 or 15,000 jobs. That is not the answer to the problems we are experiencing.

People want full-time, meaningful jobs. The importance of that is to get the basics in place, which we have. We are coming out of a serious recession. Jobs will follow. The projections are that Canada will lead in employment and economic growth over the next two years. That is very important.

I have no argument with my hon. friend that unemployment is a very serious problem. However there are different ways of tackling it.

The hon. member wants this government and the people of Canada to borrow more and to throw it at make-work projects. That is their idea of stimulating the economy. It did not work in the 1980s and it will not work today.

Mr. Maurizio Bevilacqua (York North): Madam Speaker, what this member and this party want is that the government exercise its role, a caring role, to put the unemployed back to work. We want the government to give an opportunity to young people to finish their schooling.

The hon. minister speaks about building a strong economy based on full-time jobs. Our economy lost 78,000 full-time jobs. They were replaced by 77,000 part-time jobs.

Is the minister's vision of Canada one of a jobless recovery and a part-time economy?

Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Finance and Privatization)): Madam Speaker, no it is not.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Vic Althouse (Mackenzie): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Acting Prime Minister.

I have been at farm meetings where the Prime Minister has spelled out very firmly his support of supply management and single desk marketing agencies. I listened to the minister of trade say a week or two ago that that was still the policy of the government.

Yesterday the Minister of Agriculture announced what he calls a dual marketing system for barley which seriously undermines the single desk capabilities of the Canadian Wheat Board.

Can the minister explain why this change in policy?

• (1125)

Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Finance and Privatization)): Unlike the New Democratic Party, the Progressive Conservative Party makes changes where changes are necessary, important and go with the changing times in the world today. The NDP are stuck way back in the past. It will always stay in the past because of those attitudes.

The minister announced yesterday that beginning on August 1 western barley producers can choose between marketing their feed and malt barley in Canada and the United States either through the Canadian Wheat Board or privately. The Canadian Wheat Board maintains the jurisdiction of barley marketing outside of North America. That gives a choice.

The hon. member stands up here trying to convince Canadians that this will be the downfall of the Canadian Wheat Board. I would like to point out to my hon. friend that barley sales from the Canadian Wheat Board account for only 1.2 per cent of the total sales.

Mr. Vic Althouse (Mackenzie): Madam Speaker, the government does not seem to have paid any attention to the Canadian maltsters. That is one of the few processing industries which is still Canadian owned.

The maltsters pointed out to the agriculture committee that this proposal adopted by the government would mean that they would be less competitive in the Japanese and Chinese markets in supplying a very high-priced malting product. Those are burgeoning markets with a huge potential for increase in consumption.

This move takes away the advantage the maltsters had. Now the U.S. maltsters will have access to that same high-quality barley at ostensibly lower prices because there will be those offerings that occur when it is not through a single desk marketing system.

How is it going to be better for Canadian industry when the government kills the potential and competitive advantage the malting industry had before this move?

Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Finance and Privatization)): Madam Speaker, I may have misunderstood the hon. member's question. If what he is saying is that this is going to increase sales of barley to the United States and is going to allow growers to grow some more barley and sell more barley, then I am going to say that the decision is an absolutely good one.

I have to remind the hon. member that it is a choice. I also want to remind the hon. member that the Canadian Wheat Board will continue to market barley other than in the North American market, and in the North American market if the farmers choose to market their barley that way.

Mr. Vic Althouse (Mackenzie): Madam Speaker, surely members of the government know the problems with choice. They do not give us the choice of making decisions for the government. They do not give the Liberals the choice of making decisions for the government. Those decisions are made through one place. That is the advantage the Wheat Board has given to Canadian farmers over the past 50 years and the hon. minister should understand that.

As well, the announcement said that the border would be opened between Canada and the U.S. This means that American barley which is subsidized over 47 per cent will be competing head to head on an equal footing with Canadian barley which is subsidized at 24 per cent. Under chapter 7 of the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement this becomes irreversible short of abrogating the deal.

Why was that done? Why were Canadian producers put at the disadvantage of being put up against U.S. imports of highly subsidized barley at a time when it was not required under the terms of the trade agreement? This was offered and put on the table. It is part of the announcement. It makes no sense at all.

Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Finance and Privatization)): What the hon. member is saying is that Canadian producers are afraid of competition. Wrong. They are not afraid of competition at all. They are prepared to compete fairly and will compete fairly.

We grow a great product in this country. It does not need protection from the NDP or from any government. That product can be sold world-wide because it is recognized world-wide as a top product.

• (1130)

The hon. member is wrong. There is no question that some people disagree with this move and others support it. After weighing all the evidence that was presented, the decision was made to go with a system of choice for selling barley in North America. That is what is being contemplated.

I might remind the hon. member that there is a six-year review of this program to see, after it has had an ample opportunity to operate, if it is working well like the people who are supporting it say it will. In that six-year review we will take a look at it then.

Mr. John Harvard (Winnipeg—St. James): Madam Speaker, I want to pursue the issue of barley because there is a lot of anger on the prairies today, anger brought on by the government's decision to move to a continental barley market.

The minister who has just spoken should know that for the past several months thousands of farmers and every major producer organization in Canada told the minister not to do it. The minister did not listen. Instead he turned his back on farmers. He abandoned farmers, the very people he was supposed to protect.

The president of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture calls this a betrayal. Why was it done? Why did the minister not listen to farmers?

Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Finance and Privatization)): Madam Speaker, organizations representing barley farmers support this move.

Mr. John Harvard (Winnipeg—St. James): Madam Speaker, I really find it interesting that on the day after a major announcement of this kind there is no agriculture minister here to speak on this issue.

If the minister responsible had not been so doctrinaire the issue could have been decided amicably and democratically. If push came to shove farmers wanted a plebiscite to decide the issue. That was a reasonable demand. After all, this is not the minister's barley and the wheat board—

Madam Deputy Speaker: Does the hon. member have a question?

Mr. Harvard: I have a question. Do I have some time?

Madam Deputy Speaker: The hon. member will put his question now, please.

Mr. Harvard: My question is very simple and it is for the minister responsible today. Why was this matter not put through a plebiscite which was wanted by farmers? It is as simple as that. Why not a plebiscite? Let the farmers make the decision.

Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Finance and Privatization)): Madam Speaker, I want to make it very clear that the farmers who are opposed to it can still market their barley through the Canadian Wheat Board. That is there for them to do so. They have the choice. They can market independently in North America or they can go through the wheat board.

Those farmers who want to go through the wheat board can. There is nothing to stop them from doing that.

* * *

PORT OF CHURCHILL

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre): Madam Speaker, my question is for whoever is speaking for the Minister of Transport.

Yesterday a group of private investors, aboriginal leaders and residents of northern Manitoba announced the establishment of a consortium to establish the world's first commercial polar space board.

Essential to the development of this major high-tech project in western Canada is the maintenance of the railway and port facilities of Churchill. Yet for over a year the Minister of Transport has dithered and withered and done nothing about any kind of ongoing commitment for the maintenance of that port.

Can we get a commitment today that the facility, the port and railway infrastructure of Churchill will be maintained?

Hon. Shirley Martin (Minister of State (Transport)): Madam Speaker, for the last year the Department of Transport has not been dithering on Churchill. We have been working with Churchill. We have been consulting with the people involved. The port will open this year and will stay open this year.

I am pleased to hear a consortium has been put in place in order to bring more industry to Churchill which is badly needed there.

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre): Madam Speaker, I do not think the minister understood the question. It is not a matter of the port staying open this year. It is a guarantee that the port has an ongoing, continuing future over the next several decades and not for one year. The minister has made no announcement, no statement, no declaration, to ensure the continuation of the port and railway facilities at Churchill.

Why is it that the western diversification fund rejected this project without any support whatsoever? The space agency has rejected any support and the Minister of Transport is rejecting any support. Why is the government standing in the way of a major high-tech development for western Canada?

• (1135)

Hon. Shirley Martin (Minister of State (Transport)): Madam Speaker, the government is not standing in the way of any high-tech development in western Canada or any place in the country.

This consortium has not come to the Department of Transport for any financial assistance for what it is trying to do. It is a group of private citizens who have come together to make new business.

Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre): They were turned down by your government. You should know that, if you read your brief, they were rejected.

Mrs. Martin: I do not need the hon. member's instruction on how I do my job or how I read my briefs. I am answering for the Department of Transport to the hon. member. I am telling him that the port of Churchill is open this year. It will stay open this year. We are working with the port, with the railways and with the members up there to ensure that whatever can be done for the port will be done.

Oral Questions

EMPLOYMENT

Ms. Dawn Black (New Westminster—Burnaby): Madam Speaker, my question is for the minister of employment.

Labour force data released today tragically reveals more of the same for unemployed Canadians: no jobs, no hope. The unemployed rate remains unchanged at 11.5 per cent. Full-time jobs continue to disappear as part-time jobs increase. Manufacturing jobs are disappearing. Youth unemployment is rising and the number of students who have work is dropping.

An entire generation of Canadians are losing hope. Unemployment has remained at double digits in Canada since February 1991. Meanwhile the unemployment rate in the U.S. has dropped to 6.9 per cent.

What hope can the minister offer Canadians without jobs while his government continues to accept a tragically high unemployment rate in Canada? When will this government realize that Canada works when Canadians are working?

Hon. Pauline Browes (Minister of State (Employment and Immigration)): Madam Speaker, the news of unemployed Canadians is never one that we are accepting. We are working very diligently in order to get people back to work. I would like to bring a number of indicators to the member's attention.

One is that the manpower temporary services survey showed that 21 per cent of those firms surveyed planned to hire people in July and August.

There are 116,000 more Canadians working now than there were last year. The help wanted index has taken the biggest leap in six years. Unemployment insurance claims have decreased 18 per cent in the last quarter from last year. There are some good indicators of how things are going in terms of people getting back to work.

Ms. Dawn Black (New Westminster—Burnaby): Madam Speaker, among the young people who were neither students nor in the labour force, 72 per cent were women and just over half of them were mothers. Women in this group outnumber men four to one and 60 per cent of these women reported that child care responsibilities kept them from looking for paid employment.

It should also be noted that women outnumber men in part-time positions, the only job creation in the country, by more than two to one.

How can the government continue to refuse to implement a national child care program when these figures clearly demonstrate that a lack of child care prevents women from entering the paid work force? How can this minister continue to support the economic marginalization of women in Canada?

Hon. Pauline Browes (Minister of State (Employment and Immigration)): Madam Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. member that some 944,000 more women are working today than in 1984. Between 1984 and 1992 the number of working women in managerial and administrative positions climbed 85 per cent. These positions accounted for 31 per cent of all jobs created for women between 1984 and 1992.

I think that is very good news in terms of women being in administrative and managerial positions.

* * *

CANADA POST

Mr. Jerry Pickard (Essex—Kent): Madam Speaker, my question is for the minister responsible for Canada Post.

We are in a devastating recession. Unemployment is at 11.4 per cent, two million people are on welfare, and hundreds of thousands of Canadians, including children, line up at food banks every day. The government claims it has no resources to solve those problems, yet in the face of this economic and social turmoil how can cabinet and Treasury Board approve $55 million for the purchase of Purolator?

• (1140)

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, I read in the paper where the hon. member said that he was in favour of the purchase if the alternative was sale to the United States led companies, which is the alternative. I regret his partisanship or his colleagues got to him and caused him to depart from his original, quite reasonable position.

There are no additional tax funds going into it. It is all financed internally. If he wants to know where the money is coming from, in part it came from a decision by Canada Post to contract out to the tune of $100 million a year all its internal data processing activities to another Canadian company, Systemhouse. That has generated cash so there is no cash problem.

He might be interested to know and want to applaud Canada Post for the fact that its productivity has been increasing significantly. Even during a recession it has been able to post a profit this year and there will be no increase in stamp prices effective January. Over all I think if he examines the record he will want to applaud Canada Post for an outstanding performance.

Mr. Jerry Pickard (Essex—Kent): Madam Speaker, he is quite wrong in my comment. I said it was an evil, probably a lesser evil than an American company purchasing it. However these arguments do not wash.

During the past few years this government sold Air Canada, Petro-Canada and Telesat. When the country is so financially devastated, how can it announce a $55 million purchase of Purolator? Why does the minister feel we need to own another parcel post delivery system?

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, the hon. member is quite a salesman for Canada. In OECD the finance ministers are meeting and there is agreement that out of the 21 or 22 leading industrialized nations, Canada is going to lead the world in growth, job creation and prosperity for the next two years.

The hon. member insists that Canada is not the great place that they think it is; it is a terrible place where there is great deprivation. Why cannot the hon. member accept good news? This is a good business decision that makes sense for Canada Post.

When the Liberals were in charge of Canada Post they were receiving subsidies from the taxpayers to the tune of $300 million to $400 million a year. Does he want to go back to the good old days when the taxpayers get the chance to dip into their jeans to subsidize Canada Post, or does he want to accept the record that it is an outstanding corporation that has done an outstanding job and this makes good business sense? Come on, join us.

* * *

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte): Madam Speaker, my question is for the government House leader.

We know that the Minister of the Environment has currently senior officials of his leadership campaign who were previously employed on untendered contracts in the Department of the Environment. They include Mr. David Small and Mr. Tim Ralfe.

Today we have the Minister of the Environment quoted as saying the following in *The Globe and Mail*, and I ask the government House leader to pay close attention to this quote: "The people working on our campaign are not on the government payroll as is the case from what I understand for those who are working on other campaigns".

I want to ask the government House leader, given that the Minister of the Environment has alleged quite clearly today in *The Globe and Mail* that other leadership campaigns are being bankrolled by the public purse, what is the government House leader doing on behalf of the taxpayers to put an end to this practice?

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, first off, as I listened to the quote the Minister of the Environment said no one working full time on his campaign is on the government payroll and that is the case with other leadership campaigns as well. What is wrong with that?

Yesterday the hon. member stood in the House and he quoted, for example, from an unsigned, unsolicited document. He might have got it from the member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell. Who knows where he got that document from? He stated that Mr. Ralfe's contracts exceeded $50 million in the last fiscal year and his contract was renewed in April although he seems to be working full time on the Charest campaign. That is totally false and is in fact defamatory.

If the hon. member has any respect for this institution he will apologize because the contract was not renewed. It terminated March 31. It was not for more than $50,000. Mr. Ralfe started working on the campaign after that and is not receiving anything from the Government

of Canada. That is a slanderous, defamatory statement and the hon. member should have the decency to apologize for it.

• (1145)

Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte): Madam Speaker, to set the record straight, what the minister just quoted from is not *Hansard* or my comments in the House. What the minister has just quoted from is the document that I made available to the press yesterday. He is not quoting from anything that I said anywhere inside or outside the House.

Let me quote again. What I have said with respect to Mr. Ralfe and Mr. Small is that both had received contracts, both have ended up in senior positions on the campaign, and I stand by that.

Let me quote again the question at hand. The Minister of the Environment is quoted in today's *Globe and Mail*—let us be careful and let us listen carefully, minister—as saying: "The people working on our campaign are not on the government payroll, as is the case from what I understand for those who are working on other campaigns".

The story goes on to say: "The minister refused to name which candidates he believed were bankrolling their campaigns from the public purse".

I want to ask the minister, given that the Minister of the Environment has alleged that campaigns other than his are currently bankrolling their leadership campaigns from the public purse, what action will he take to investigate this allegation? Will he talk to the Minister of the Environment and will he put an end to this abuse?

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): What we are seeing here is an abuse of the principle of parliamentary immunity, where the hon. member stands up and slanders and libels individuals. He said he was quoting a document, therefore he is immune. In other words, if somebody puts a piece of libellous material in his hands he feels it is perfectly reasonable and appropriately responsible to stand up and damage reputations.

I would to remind the hon. member of what Shakespeare said: "Steal my purse, you steal trash; steal my reputation, you steal my life". The hon. member should think a little more carefully and be a little more responsible before he goes after someone.

I repeat again: What he just said—

Ms. Copps: Answer the question.

Mr. Harvard: He is quoting your own minister.

Mr. Andre: If hon. members would keep their mouths shut and not interrupt me I would continue.

Madam Deputy Speaker: The hon. minister may finish.

Mr. Andre: The hon. member is incapable of keeping his mouth shut apparently, Madam Speaker. The hon. member quoted, saying that "no one on our campaign is on the government payroll, as is the case I understand". In other words, that is the case in other campaigns as well. It is clearly, clearly contrary to the rules set down by the Prime Minister when we announced the leadership campaign that nobody working full time on campaigns can be on the government payroll. That is clearly the policy.

The hon. member has no evidence. Yesterday he made allegations, his colleagues made allegations about David Small. They are all false. Have the decency to withdraw those allegations unless you have proof.

* * *

FORESTRY

Mr. Brian L. Gardiner (Prince George—Bulkley Valley): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Forestry. It relates to a decision made by the government in the recent budget to allow forest agreements between the federal government and the provinces to expire once those agreements have run out.

The minister will know from previous statements in the House and other comments on the record that the government had at one time viewed these agreements as an excellent demonstration of effective co-operation between the federal and provincial governments, which have joined with the forest industry and private forest managers to work toward a more economic wood supply, along with providing very important funding for work in replanting, silviculture work, research and the management of woodlots.

My question to the minister is this. Will the minister and the government reconsider the decision of the Minister of Finance to allow the forest agreements to expire?

Hon. Frank Oberle (Minister of Forestry): Madam Speaker, my hon. friend is right; these agreement did all of the things that the hon. member mentioned.

The fact of the matter is that our needs change, society's needs change, and new arrangements need to be made to satisfy both Canada's public need and the obligations that we have internationally.

• (1150)

The ministers of forestry and the Canadian Council of Forest Ministers are not surprised at this decision because we have been working over the last few years and have designed a more legitimate role for the federal government in forestry, one through which we can make much longer term commitments.

The model forest program for instance is an indication of what the future role of the federal government will be in this area, with increased research and science related activities and it is in these areas that the public demands our activities.

Mr. Brian L. Gardiner (Prince George—Bulkley Valley): Madam Speaker, my supplementary is for the same minister.

The minister and other members of the government will know that the former President of the Treasury Board has conducted, as we understand it from news reports, a detailed internal review of the make-up of the Government of Canada. Some of the leadership contenders from the government side are talking about scaling back the federal cabinet.

I wonder if the minister would have any advice for us as to whether there will be a Minister of Forestry in the future. Does he support keeping the job he has now at least for a short period of time and will there be a cabinet post to protect one of Canada's most important resources in the future?

Hon. Frank Oberle (Minister of Forestry): Madam Speaker, obviously I cannot predict what a future Prime Minister will do in terms of responding to the clear demands of society to streamline, modernize, and rationalize the operations of government in the same way that the private sector and other institutions need to be adjusted to meet modern demands.

The hon. member ought to look at the record of this government over the last eight years in terms of what it has accomplished in forestry, the new national forest strategy, the Canada forest accord, the model forests program, all of these great institutions that have made this department indispensable in terms of how the federal government discharges its obligations. That would give him an indication of where we might be moving in the future.

* * *

DISABLED PERSONS

Mr. Bruce Halliday (Oxford): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of State for Transport.

This being National Access Awareness Week it is important we note that one of the greatest obstacles disabled Canadians face is the availability of accessible transportation whether for employment or for recreational activities. It has been a major concern of the Standing Committee on Human Rights and the Status of Disabled Persons.

I would like to ask the minister whether she or the government have had any success in providing assistance to our struggling transportation industries in trying to make accessible transportation more available to disabled Canadians.

Hon. Shirley Martin (Minister of State (Transport)): Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member and the members of all parties who served on this committee for the outstanding work they have done to make life easier for disabled people in Canada.

Certainly within the transportation industry we have made big strides in the last year under the national strategy that was announced by the Prime Minister in 1991.

Just yesterday at Ottawa airport I was able to announce the contribution of $120,000 to Air Canada to provide loading bridges not only at Ottawa but at Moncton, Vancouver and Calgary along with the regional airlines to allow a dignified access to small aircraft.

At the same time there was another $98,000 given to Thrifty Car Rental and to Hertz Rent A Car in Ottawa to provide hand controls and accessible vehicles for wheelchairs.

These are taking place right across the country and I am pleased with the co-operation we have had from the airlines, even under difficult times, to make sure that transportation is better.

There is one disappointment I do have if I may just take this one minute. The national press has not focused on any of the work that has been done in this area, so that those people who are not able to leave their homes are able to see what is available for them and that the world and certainly Canada has opened up to allow them to travel.

* * *

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Madam Speaker, my question is for the government House leader and it relates to the issue raised by the member for Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte.

A few moments ago the minister refused to answer the question in regard to the statement of the Minister of the Environment yesterday who said "the people working on our campaign are not on the government payroll as is the case from what I understand for those who are working on other campaigns".

The next statement was the following: "Mr. Charest did not say which of his opponents he was referring to". In other words, which of his opponents was cheating taxpayers.

• (1155)

The minister has to answer the following questions: Has he been made aware of the charges made by the Minister of the Environment? What is he doing to protect the taxpayers as is his duty as Acting Prime Minister today?

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, I did answer the question, if the hon. member had chosen to listen. He knows full well that the rules of the Progressive Conservative Party, as set down by the Prime Minister, are very clear. Nobody shall work on a campaign during the time they are being paid to work for the government in any capacity. He knows those are the rules.

I would ask the hon. member, since he stood up in the House with his colleague from Newfoundland and slandered Mr. David Small and Mr. Tim Ralfe, whether he would have the decency to stand up and apologize for those slanders.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Madam Speaker, I will let you decide whether the minister can make that claim of slander without any backing to make that charge against another member of the House. You may do that at the appropriate time.

Right now the minister has to answer, not about accusations I made but accusations made by the Minister of the Environment, accusations that he refused to elaborate upon when he was asked to do so by André Picard of the Quebec bureau of *The Globe and Mail*.

Will the minister now finally answer the question that has been asked here today? Will he tell us what he intends to do to find out from the Minister of the Environment who the Minister of the Environment was referring to about the breach of the rules and about the fact that people on government payroll, according to him, were bankrolling campaigns of other Conservative candidates? Will he answer that question?

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, to begin with I would suggest that the hon. member reread what was said. It was not the Minister of the Environment who made that statement, it was André Picard.

The reality is, and particularly with respect to this leadership campaign, that which is written by reporters is sometimes a significant departure from what in fact actually happened.

I would ask the hon. member again, if he is suggesting that the allegations that he and his colleague made in respect to Mr. Small and Mr. Ralfe are substantiated and he believes them to be true, to make those allegations and take the traditional posture that if he turns out to be wrong in his allegations he will do what tradition requires and resign his seat.

* * *

FOREIGN AID

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of External Relations.

As we all know, if the global environment is to be protected, poverty in the developing world must be reduced. One year ago in Rio at the earth summit this government made a commitment to provide additional funds to the Third World.

How is it possible for Canada to do that if it is cutting its foreign aid?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Monique Vézina (Minister of External Relations and Minister of State (Seniors)): Madam Speaker, CIDA continues and is determined to pursue and actively support the program approved at the Rio summit. The environmental guidelines for sustainable development published in 1992 have been observed in all CIDA programs.

I also wish to confirm here in the House that sustainable development, as a fully integrated policy component, is a priority and indeed a requirement in all our international development assistance programs.

[*English*]

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Madam Speaker, the minister has difficulty in dealing with my question.

In an op-ed article today in *The Globe and Mail* the minister herself praises her foreign aid policy program but does not mention the poor nations.

The question therefore is this: Is it still this government's goal to help the poorest countries as promised in her department document *Sharing Our Future*? How does the minister explain the cancellation of aid to Ethiopia, Madagascar, Burundi, Uganda, Kenya and Tanzania?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Monique Vézina (Minister of External Relations and Minister of State (Seniors)): Madam Speaker, as we have repeated time and time again since December last year, there were some difficult decisions to make, following the cuts in funding for international development assistance. We have maintained our government priorities, including, of course, aid to the poorest nations.

• (1200)

Through our programs we are maintaining our support for the poorest nations, who need the assistance of the Canadian government. We have set up special programs under which these nations can request assistance. These include environmental programs and programs with an economic and commercial framework.

Very briefly, Madam Speaker, the government is meeting its commitments, protecting sustainable development and helping the poorest countries throughout the world.

[*English*]

Madam Deputy Speaker: I have received notice of a question of privilege.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte): Madam Speaker, I rise today on a question of privilege regarding actions that are being taken. I believe these actions interfere with my ability to do my job as a member of Parliament.

I received in the lobby a minute or two before Question Period from the law firm of Radnoff, Pearl, Slover, Swedko, Dwoskin notice of its intention to reserve the right to bring action against me unless I make certain withdrawals. This notice was served to me in the lobby of the House of Commons a few minutes ago. I regard it as a deliberate act to prevent me from doing my job. I shall explain why.

Even as I speak, the government House leader is reading from that legal notice given to me. The government House leader obviously had in his hand in advance of the notice being served on me in the lobby, a copy of the letter from the law firm in question. During Question Period the government House leader quoted directly from the letter in question served on me. He is looking at it now, as I speak.

You quoted from it earlier, Harvie. Somebody sitting behind you in the Chamber watched you quote from it. I tracked you as you quoted from it.

I am prepared to make the letter available to the Speaker. I am prepared to have you, Madam Speaker,

check *Hansard* and see that the government House leader quoted directly from this letter.

It is crystal clear that the communications manager of the Charest campaign, Mr. Ralfe, his law firm, which I have just named, and the government House leader are acting in consort in attempting to intimidate and prevent a member of Parliament from doing his job and to undertake his duties.

Madam Speaker, I ask you to investigate this co-ordinated attempt to shut up a member of Parliament, to introduce libel chill. If you find a prima facie case for this question of privilege, I am prepared to move the appropriate motion.

I ask the government House leader to table the letter he quoted from in Question Period. It will be crystal clear that it is exactly the same document I myself only received a minute or two before Question Period. Clearly he had it in his hands. As part of a co-ordinated attempt to shut down, to intimidate, to shut up a member of Parliament who is doing his job, the minister opposite chose to use it. I am sure by now he regrets his rather foolish action.

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, finally at the end we got the truth.

Indeed I was told that this letter had been given to the member.

Mr. Tobin: You have it.

Mr. Andre: I was given a copy of the letter and he admitted that he received the letter before Question Period. I received it after it was sent to him.

The quote I read—and he can check the "blues"—was right from the document the hon. member circulated. The point is the quote is exactly what I read from the letter. It was exactly out of this document. The word is this:

> Ralfe whose contracts exceeded $50,000 in the last fiscal year, had his contract renewed in April. Although he seems to be working full time on the Charest campaign, Ralfe has an active contract with the department.

That is a false statement.

The hon. member distributed this false information outside in the lobby during the scrums endeavouring to ruin another reputation. Somehow he thinks it enhances the political system and his own reputation by going out and spreading false information.

I will let the recipient or victim of this deal with it on his own.

• (1205)

I maintain the point is that the level of respect in which this institution is held is not aided by hon. members using parliamentary immunity to stand up and slander individuals who do not have the privilege of coming in to defend themselves. I will let the hon. member deal with that.

In any event, at no time did I hear in his comments anything having to do with the rules of privilege in this House. I fail to understand what his point of privilege would be in respect to how he was prevented from doing his duty in the House by whatever is happening.

He has the letter in his hand and if he chooses to table it he may do so. I do not care. The point is I believe the letter deals with what the hon. member said in particular out in the scrum by handing out material which is slanderous and wrong.

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Madam Speaker, I think the electronic *Hansard* will show that during Question Period the minister did quote directly from a two-page letter. I believe that the tradition of the House is that when a minister or a member quotes from a document that person is required to table that document.

I would ask that the minister table the document he used in his response, which was a two-page letter.

Hon. Frank Oberle (Minister of Forestry): Madam Speaker, in your examination of this letter I would also draw to your attention the fact that my hon. friend opposite indicated that the Liberal Party does have people sitting in the gallery who are reading mail and the documents that ministers have in front of them. If there was ever a question of privilege to be raised that ought to be it.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Madam Speaker, I think when deciding upon this decision there are two points which you might want to consider.

The first thing that you might want to consider, Madam Speaker, is whether this is an attempt to intimidate an MP in the exercise of his function.

The second point to consider is the fact that the hon. member for Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte was served with this letter from this law firm here on Parliament Hill. As Madam Speaker will be well aware, a member cannot be served with a legal notice of this nature here if it is a court document. In a civil case that cannot be done on Parliament Hill. Given the fact that it cannot be done,

the purpose of this letter is to have the same effect, in other words, to serve this upon the member in like manner from what I have described previously. Therefore I claim, and I ask Madam Speaker to consider the fact, that particular letter should not have been delivered to the hon. member on Parliament Hill by the law firm in question.

Mr. Crosby: Delivered not served.

Mr. Boudria: I regret to interrupt the member for Halifax West who undoubtedly has something terribly important to tell us. However if the government maintains that everything is appropriate here, then surely it would welcome the parliamentary committee investigating this situation and reporting to the House forthwith. If not, I will be left with the conclusion that the point of the hon. minister is hard to defend.

Mr. Andre: Madam Speaker, I welcome the opportunity of having a committee of Parliament look into the slanderous and false accusations of the hon. member to see whether that is appropriate parliamentary behaviour.

Mr. Tobin: Madam Speaker, he has not tabled the letter. Table the letter. Madam Speaker, you should secure that letter. It was quoted from in this House. The minister is now running out of the House without tabling the letter. Madam Speaker should not allow the government House leader to run from Parliament, to run from the House of Commons, with the letter still in his pocket. This gives proof to my suggestion that this has been a co-ordinated attempt by people outside the House and inside the House to shut up a member of Parliament.

Madam Deputy Speaker: I have listened very carefully to what was said during Question Period and during the exchange following the hon. member raising that question of privilege. I have listened to all sides. I will, of course, take everything under advisement.

• (1210)

However two points need to be made at this time. The hon. member for Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte kept asking me to force the hon. minister to table the letter. The minister can only be forced to table a state document, which is not the case at this point. I cannot force the hon. member to table a document that is not a state document. This document does not come from the Government of Canada.

Mr. Boudria: That is not in the rules. I am sorry.

Madam Deputy Speaker: We can discuss that later on. At this point this is my decision.

Mr. Tobin: He is burning it as we speak.

Madam Deputy Speaker: We will review *Hansard*.

There is also a question about legal documents being served or delivered on the precinct without the Speaker's express permission. That is also something that causes me some concern.

The whole situation will be reviewed and I will come back to the House as soon as possible.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

AGRICULTURE

TABLING OF PROPOSALS

Hon. Shirley Martin (Minister of State (Transport)): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), I would like to table, in both official languages, the following proposals to amend the Western Grain Transportation Act, the National Transportation Act 1987, the Canadian Wheat Board Act and the Farm Income Protection Act.

* * *

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Rob Nicholson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister of State (Agriculture)): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 62 petitions.

[*Editor's Note: See today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

* * *

BILL C-106

REPORT OF LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

Mr. Walter Van De Walle (St. Albert): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present the report of the legislative committee on Bill C-106, an act to amend certain petroleum-related acts in respect of Canadian ownership requirements and to confirm the validity of a certain

regulation, without amendment, in both official languages.

* * *

BILL C-121

REPORT OF LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

Mr. Ross Belsher (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present the report of the legislative committee on Bill C-121, an act to amend the Canada Shipping Act and to amend another act in consequence thereof, with amendments, in both official languages.

While I have the floor I would ask the consent of the House to waive the notice requirement for the report stage of Bill C-121 so that the bill can be called for on Monday, June 7.

Madam Speaker, I think if you were to ask the House there would be consent from all sides.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent of the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

[*Editor's Note: See today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

* * *

PETITIONS

CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. John Reimer (Kitchener): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition on behalf of 111 residents of Waterloo county.

They draw attention to the fact that the depiction of sexually explicit actions involving children and violence against women offends normal standards of decency, portrays an abnormal view of societal values and is harmful to the family unit.

These petitioners call upon the federal government to pass strong Criminal Code sanctions against the publication and distribution of films, videos and television programs depicting explicit sexual acts and the use of children and violence against women in a sexual context.

SERIAL KILLER CARDS

Mr. Gilbert Parent (Welland—St. Catharines—Thorold): Madam Speaker, I was contacted some time ago by a group of people who are very much concerned about the killer cards that are being sold in Canada. I have eight petitions I would like to present which have literally thousands and thousands of names upon them.

• (1215)

These people wish to make known their disapproval of the sale of what is known as killer cards in Canada. They urge the government to stop the entry of these cards into Canada.

The petitioners, and I include myself, abhor crimes of violence against persons. They believe that killer trading cards offer nothing positive for children or adults to admire or emulate but rather contribute to violence. Therefore they think these should be banned from Canada.

YOUNG OFFENDERS

Mr. Jim Karygiannis (Scarborough—Agincourt): Madam Speaker, I am rising today to present a petition of many thousand signatures gathered by Mr. and Mrs. Crawford, who are here with us today in the gallery. Their son was viciously murdered and left in a Scarborough sewer by three young offenders.

The petitioners state that the need to protect society is much more important than the need to protect young offenders.

CHILD POVERTY

Ms. Dawn Black (New Westminster—Burnaby): Madam Speaker, I rise to present a petition that is signed by well over 100 citizens of Canada, mostly in New Westminster in my constituency, who express their concerns about child poverty.

They reflect back to the motion that was passed unanimously in the House of Commons in November 1989 which said that we as a country would eliminate child poverty by the year 2000.

They cite the ever-increasing cost to the administration of health care, justice, and social welfare. They say that poor children are inhibited in learning and preparation for employment. This constitutes a large cost to future national productivity and the country.

They call upon Parliament to take the actions necessary to reaffirm its commitment to seek the elimination of poverty among children in Canada by the year 2000 and to develop a plan for the implementation of this commitment.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. Ross Belsher (Fraser Valley East): Madam Speaker, it is my duty and privilege to table in the House two petitions signed by 72 of my constituents in Fraser Valley East, and more specifically in the Chilliwack and Sardis area.

They call on the government to take the necessary steps to provide a national referendum on the subject of the official languages of Canada.

VIOLENCE

Hon. Shirley Martin (Lincoln): Madam Speaker, it is my honour and privilege to present two petitions on behalf of the constituents of Lincoln and the towns of Jordan, Vineland, Beamsville, Grimsby, Stoney Creek and surrounding areas. The petitions concern the killer cards and the serial killer board games that are entering this country.

In the first petition the petitioners request Parliament to consider amending the Criminal Code of Canada so that violent and degrading materials such as the serial killer board game can be kept from distribution in Canada.

In the second petition the petitioners ask that we amend the laws of Canada to prohibit the importation, distribution, sale and manufacture of killer cards in law and to advise producers of killer cards that their product, if destined for Canada, will be seized and destroyed.

Mr. Robert E. Skelly (Comox—Alberni): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present a similar petition.

It calls on Parliament to consider amending the Criminal Code of Canada so that violent and degrading material such as the serial killer board game and the mass murder trading cards can be kept from being distributed in Canada.

PHARMACEUTICALS

Mr. Robert E. Skelly (Comox—Alberni): Madam Speaker, I also have a petition from a number of petitioners throughout the province of British Columbia.

They call on Parliament to not proceed with Bill C-91—it is a little late for that—and to repeal Bill C-22, which was passed in 1987, so that Canadians will have full benefit from lower priced generic drugs and provincial and private drug plans can serve Canadians without being forced to charge higher fees and/or to provide less coverage.

JUSTICE

Mr. Robert E. Skelly (Comox—Alberni): Madam Speaker, I also have a petition from people throughout the province of British Columbia. Thousands of names have been presented in the past on this petition.

It is presented in memory of Dawn Shaw, a six-year old girl who was murdered and sexually assaulted in my riding. It calls for a number of changes in the criminal justice system and in the way that sexual offenders are handled through the justice system or when being released from prison so that they can be monitored in the community.

The petitioners, in memory of Dawn Shaw, request that Parliament enact legislation to change the justice system to provide greater protection for children from sexual assault and to assure the conviction of offenders.

• (1220)

PEACE TRUST FUND

Mr. Ray Funk (Prince Albert—Churchill River): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to table in the House petitions signed by 1,253 Canadians from Saskatchewan, Winnipeg, Vancouver, Vancouver Island, Toronto, Ottawa, Hamilton, Kitchener, Niagara, Elmira and many other communities in Canada.

The petitioners call on the Parliament of Canada to establish a peace trust fund which would allow Canadian taxpayers, who for reasons of conscience or religion, choose to direct a portion of their taxes paid to the government away from military uses and to a fund which would use the resources so directed for peace education, research, humanitarian aid and other peaceful purposes.

As the author of a private member's bill calling for the establishment of such a fund, I would like to thank all of the people who have worked so hard across the country to make this effort a success.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. Bob Kilger (Stormont—Dundas): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I wish to present a petition on behalf of 29 constituents of Stormont—Dundas who call upon Parliament to enact legislation providing for a referendum of the acceptance or rejection of two official languages, English and French, for the government and the people of Canada.

[*Translation*]

THE ELIMINATION OF VIOLENCE

Mr. Bob Kilger (Stormont—Dundas): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I wish to present a petition I received from Notre-Dame-du-Saint-Rosaire School in Crysler during education week on May 7, when I attended the official opening of their public awareness campaign against violence.

I was given a petition under the theme: "Hand in hand for a violence free world", supporting the efforts of Ms. Cléroux who condemns the sale of violent games, especially the serial killer board game, first edition.

[*English*]

WATER DIVERSION

Mr. Brian L. Gardiner (Prince George—Bulkley Valley): Madam Speaker, I have the pleasure to table a petition today signed by residents of British Columbia who are expressing their concerns about a company by the name of Multinational Resources whose plans are to dam and divert the North Thompson River into Kinbasket Lake for eventual sale to California.

GORE BAY-MANITOULIN AIRPORT

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present two petitions today. The first petition has about 175 signatures on it concerning representations to the government to maintain the manned weather station at the Gore Bay-Manitoulin Airport.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Madam Speaker, the second petition has 36 names on it calling on the government to enact legislation to provide for a referendum on the two official languages of Canada.

BILL C-113

Mr. Cid Samson (Timmins—Chapleau): Madam Speaker, I rise to table a petition today signed by hundreds of Canadians from Chatham, Wallaceburg, Sarnia, Renfrew, Arnprior, Caledonia, Guelph, Hamilton, Burlington, Whitehorse, Calgary, St. John's, Sudbury and, among others, one individual signed it "Homeless, Canada". The petitioners call on the government, as is their right, to repeal Bill C-113, which has been passed. They cite it specifically because of the reduction from 60 per cent to 50 per cent in UI benefits and also that the bill has frozen Public Service wages without collective bargaining. It has increased the cost of grain transportation and has decreased public utility tax returns to the provinces. They call upon Parliament at this time to repeal C-113.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk)

Mr. Rob Nicholson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister of State (Agriculture)): Madam Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 472 and 492.

[*Text*]

Question No. 472—**Mr. Duhamel:**

What is the total number of aboriginal women employed in a legal capacity within (a) the Department of Justice (b) other federal departments (c) crown corporations and governmental agencies (d) human rights commissions?

Mr. Rob Nicholson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister of State (Agriculture)): (a) Three lawyers and one articling student have self-identified. *(b) and (c) Legal services to the Government of Canada, with the exception of those provided to certain independent agencies, PCO and External Affairs are exclusively provided by the Department of Justice.

In so far as PCO and EA are concerned: none.

(d) One lawyer has self-identified at the Canadian Human Rights Commission*.

*Figures are based on voluntary self-identification and may not therefore accurately disclose the number of employees who are aboriginal women and who are lawyers or articling students.

Question No. 492—**Miss Grey (Beaver River):**

During the period November 1, 1992, through December 15, 1992, did the Department of Justice produce firearms amnesty television advertisements and, if so (a) how many types of ads (b) what were the lengths (i.e. 15 or 30 seconds) of these advertisements (c) how many times did each of these advertisements appear on television (d) what other attempts were made to alert firearm owners of the amnesty (e) was direct mail used in the advertising campaign (f) was any attempt made to contact firearm owners through their clubs or through the police (g) what was the cost of each of these methods of contact and the cost of the firearms amnesty advertising campaign as a whole (h) what efforts were taken to train police officers in the proper procedures necessitated by the new regulations (i) what costs were incurred by the Department of Justice to train these police officers?

Mr. Rob Nicholson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister of State (Agriculture)): In response to the above noted inquiry, it is important to emphasize that the Department of Justice Canada developed and implemented a comprehensive public information and advertising campaign (PLIA) for the firearms control legislation in August 1992 in joint co-operation with the provincial and territorial governments. The firearms amnesty advertising, which included television ads, was but one component of this campaign.

(a) There was one ad produced, in English and in French, for the amnesty. When the amnesty period was extended, the same ad was re-run with a caption highlighting the extension period.

(b) The length of this ad was 30 seconds.

(c) TV advertising spots were purchased on all major English and French networks for a total of 630 gross rating points, with the ads likely to have reached on average 70-75 per cent of adults in Canada.

(d) In addition to the television advertising, there was a householder distributed nationally in September 1992 to 11 million Canadian households which highlighted the key components of the new firearms control legislation. It included a section devoted to the firearms amnesty.

Amnesty ads (total of 400 lines) were also placed in all weekly and ethnic newspapers during the first two weeks of November 1992.

A brochure on the firearms amnesty program was also produced and sent in large quantities to the offices of the chief provincial and territorial firearms officers and to police services across Canada for distribution to the general public. This brochure along with several press releases announcing the amnesty were sent to the members of the media in advance of the amnesty period. During the course of the amnesty and more than one month after it was all over, results were reported by police detachments across the country on a weekly basis and then issued to the members of the media.

In addition, senior federal and provincial justice officials and members of the RCMP, provincial and local police services across Canada did a great many interviews about the amnesty with members of the national, regional and local print, radio and television media, the week leading up to the start of the amnesty and during the amnesty period.

(e) As mentioned above, a national householder (news sheet tabloid format) was distributed in the form of direct mail to 11 million Canadian households prior to the amnesty.

(f) Beginning in April 1992, a substantial effort was made to notify firearms owners about the firearms amnesty through a direct mail-out of press releases. This information was sent to firearms organizations, most gun clubs, firearms interest groups and police services across the country.

As well, a firearms amnesty training and information video was developed and distributed to police services agencies across Canada and to firearms owners and users and to the general public. This video enabled police officers to respond to inquiries made by Firearms owners and the general public about the firearms amnesty.

(g) The total federal costs for the firearms public information and advertising program for the firearms amnesty include the production, printing/duplication and distribution of the following elements:

Householder**	$1,076,329
Television advertising	1,512,452
Amnesty brochure	58,424
Amnesty information packages	50,000
Amnesty training and information video	122,275
	$2,819,480

** The householder included a small section devoted to the firearms amnesty. The cost of $1,076,329 is for the complete tabloid copy.

Therefore, the estimated federal costs for the firearms amnesty information campaign were approximately $2,819,480.

Costs borne by the provincial and local police services across Canada to advertise and inform (television, radio, print) their public about amnesty are not reported.

(h) In order to ensure police were trained in the proper procedures necessitated by the legislation and regulations, and the conduct of the amnesty program, a police training program was developed, in partnership with the RCMP and provincial and territorial governments, and delivered in four regions of Canada. This program included:

(1) a developmental workshop in Ottawa,
(2) four regional workshops (Vancouver, British Columbia; London, Ontario; Montreal, Quebec; and Halifax, Nova Scotia);
(3) a comprehensive police training manual; and
(4) a series of training and information videos.

Over 400 police officers from across Canada (recommended by the chief provincial and territorial firearms officers to become instructors) were trained during these sessions. Upon completion of the training program, these police instructors returned to their respective provinces and police services and trained their own personnel using materials developed by my department (training manual and information videos). The training and information videos have been distributed to the general public, and are now being distributed to firearms safety education trainers as part of the safety training program.

(i) The total cost to the Department of Justice Canada for the conduct of this training program was $1.2 million. The costs incurred by the provinces and territories to train other police officers in their respective jurisdictions are not reported to the department.

[*English*]

Mr. Nicholson: I ask, Madam Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Foster: Madam Speaker, my point of order concerns the tabling of a document this afternoon by the Minister of State for Transport which concerned Western Grain Transportation Act draft legislation.

When legislation of that type is tabled in the House it should be made available to members. My understanding is that an inquiry to the Table has resulted in this document not being available. It should be available to members today just as it is available to the minister. The minister is having a press conference at this moment in western Canada. He should be making that statement in the House of Commons. If he cannot do that then at least the document which is tabled here should be made available.

I would ask that the officers of the House take action to ensure that that document named the Western Grain Transportation Act draft legislation be made available to members immediately.

• (1225)

Madam Deputy Speaker: I thank the hon. member. I will inquire. I was not aware of the situation. What has to be done will be done and as soon as possible.

Questions No. 472 and No. 492 as enumerated by the hon. parliamentary secretary have been answered. Shall all the other questions stand?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

NUNAVUT LAND CLAIMS AGREEMENT ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Siddon that Bill C-133, an act respecting an agreement between the Inuit of the Nunavut Settlement Area and Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

Mr. Robert E. Skelly (Comox—Alberni): Madam Speaker, I want to say that on behalf of the leader of my party, the member for Yukon, and on behalf of my caucus I am pleased to take part in this debate as aboriginal critic for the New Democratic Party.

I am also grateful to the House for the kindness in allowing me to delay my participation in this debate until after Question Period, but I feel I must extend an apology to those who are visiting us from the Inuit community for having to submit them to the debate that took place during Question Period. Hopefully we are now getting on to better things.

The Nunavut claim settlement and the creation of the territory of Nunavut is something of which all Canadians can be proud. It is something that all Canadians and this Parliament should be celebrating today. We should be recognizing it as a great event in the progress of Canada's Confederation and Canada's political development. This is the first political boundary change in Canada since the addition of the province of Newfoundland and Labrador in 1949, I think it was. This is the first great change in the structure of Canada since that time.

I want to associate myself with the remarks of the member for Nunatsiaq who congratulated all of those Inuit people who took part in the negotiations from the very beginning, initiating the proposal in the first place and pursuing the proposal over a 20-year period—a fifth of a century—with patience, persistence and persuasiveness until they reached this point where Nunavut is almost a reality, depending on the outcome of the debate in this House today and where the land claims settlement is finally to be ratified by the House of Commons. I would like to associate myself with that member in indicating that the Inuit people who have been involved in pursuing this issue and involved in the negotiations have done a terrific job.

I would also like to add something because it occurred, I suppose, right up until the last couple of days. The Inuit negotiators have always been understanding, open and willing to negotiate with those aboriginal groups on their borders who felt that there were conflicting claims within the Nunavut settlement area. They wanted to do what they could either to facilitate resolving those claims when the need was to approach the government or other parties, or when it was helpful to change the wording in the agreements themselves.

They were always willing to provide agreements that satisfied in particular the Denesuline from northern Saskatchewan and from northern Manitoba. They were willing to provide them with assurance that this agreement and this legislation did not prejudice any treaty rights or any process to resolve their concerns about treaty rights north of 60 degrees.

The Inuit negotiators have always been open, understanding and willing to discuss with the people on their borders the methods for resolving the difficulties that they may have with the creation of Nunavut and also how those aboriginal groups can still retail their right of action to pursue their treaty rights.

• (1230)

I am not really feeling comfortable about doing this next part but I would also like to congratulate the government and the minister of Indian affairs for the role he has played in finally bringing this process after a fifth of a century to a conclusion. I think it is a happy conclusion for all concerned.

This is something that can go on the credit side of the ledger as far as this government is concerned. I am not willing to say that about a lot of the other things that the minister has done or neglects to do. However in this case I think one will find that the House almost universally accepts that in this case he has done a good thing.

He might have been prodded into it and in many cases persuaded and cajoled. In any case the government for the most part has responded in the right way. For that reason we see the creation today of the settlement of the Nunavut land claims settlements and also the creation of the new territory of Nunavut.

I do not want to be too positive about the minister in these discussions for reasons one may find out later. However we have some concerns about the legislation. They are concerns that result from leaks of polling that were done by a Decima poll which suggest that Canadians are concerned about the amount of money that is being given to the Inuit people under this legislation.

The newspaper reports on this issue have indicated that it could be anywhere from $580 million 1989 Canadian dollars meaning something like $1.14 billion discounted Canadian dollars over time. Really, if we analyse the situation closely then the wording of these agreements should actually reflect the truth of the matter.

As my colleague from Nunatsiaq pointed out, the greatest transfer taking place in these land claim settlements is the transfer of vast areas of land, resources and potential for royalties and revenues from those resources that are not going to the Inuit people. These are going to the people of Canada by finally settling an outstanding dispute over land and resources between the people who owned them originally and have occupied them for 4,000 years at least as far as we can see on that time horizon.

In order to make it possible for us as non-aboriginals and as Inuit to live together it has been agreed to turn that land over to the administration of a public government which is one of the governments of Canada to which all Canadians will have access. They will keep for their own use a very small amount which is as my colleague from Nunatsiaq said. It is something like 2 per cent of subsurface areas and up to 18 per cent of the total land surface. The people who are the real beneficiaries of this agreement are the people of Canada.

The minister in his education programs on this issue and in his polling should be asking the question in those ways rather than leaving it distorted in people's minds. They feel that the aboriginal people are the recipients when truly the aboriginal people are the givers in this case.

Canada is the beneficiary. In part as well aboriginal people are the beneficiaries. We have settled this issue for the time being. There is an opportunity for Canadians as a whole and for Inuit people in the eastern Arctic to co-exist and work together. The mechanisms have been put in place for us to do that.

The wording of the agreement talks about the Inuit people receiving certain rights with respect to fish, wildlife and land. In fact those were their inherent rights from time immemorial.

• (1235)

I am concerned that the wording of the agreement does not really signify that. Nor does the agreement recognize, as my colleague pointed out, that there is an aboriginal title to these areas. The agreement stops far short of that by saying there is an assertion of a claim to aboriginal rights.

At some point the government really has to get to the point and start telling the truth about the fact. We came close to recognizing that truth during the Charlottetown debate. We began a debate around the issue of inherent rights, where those inherent rights derive from an occupancy of the land and the organization among aboriginal people of states with virtual national capabilities on the land. In the future our claims settlements are going to have to recognize the reality of the situation that first, aboriginal people have these rights and second, they are giving the rights to Canadians and that Canadians are the beneficiaries.

I am going to say a bit about the negative things the minister has either done or things he has neglected to do in the past, only because they may reflect on the legacy of problems that the new government of Nunavut may have to deal with. There is no question about it. When looking at the report cards on this government and previous governments of Canada, both nationally and internationally, there is a great deal of business that has been left undone with respect to the aboriginal people in this country.

Essentially this agreement still talks about a colonial type of relationship between Canada and its aboriginal people. That kind of relationship causes serious social problems. It takes power away from the colonized people and gives it to the colonisers. To some extent this legislation is now turning that around so that the colonisers are now giving up power and empowering the colonized people.

Members of the aboriginal affairs committee travelled around this country. We found one thing in virtually every case we studied, whether it was post-secondary education, aboriginal literacy, or aboriginal housing. That is that the most effective people in identifying the problems that needed to be recognized in their communities and the most effective people in developing solutions and delivering programs dealing with those problems were the aboriginal people themselves.

There is a tremendous advantage both to the aboriginal people and the Government of Canada to make sure that they have the resources and the power to deal with those programs. By far they are the best and most effective people to solve those kinds of problems.

The minister bears a lot of responsibility for things that have been left undone. Things like the Lubicon Cree and Davis Inlet, names like Shamattawa and Big Cove are going to come back in his dreams to haunt him. A lot of problems have not been dealt with fairly, accurately and effectively by this minister and his government. Unfortunately those are going to become a part of the legacy the people of Nunavut will have to deal with.

I am confident that when aboriginal people handle their own affairs, they will be more effective and better able to quickly get to the solutions than this federal government has been.

The government we are talking about deals with a population of 17,000 spread over that which is now one of the largest territories in Canada. It is going to be a very difficult issue for a government to deal with.

• (1240)

Fortunately in these agreements there is access to royalties. Therefore a percentage of revenue coming from minerals and other sources will go to the government of Nunavut. There are also other means for obtaining revenues. However, it is going to be a tremendous problem for this government to deal with the problems they have experienced over such a huge area.

We have already seen in the Northwest Territories where a government is spending something like 20 per cent of its total resources on housing. Those are the kinds of legacies being left by the minister to the people of the new territory of Nunavut.

How are they going to deal with housing? Is the minister going to have the responsibility for transferring the money with respect to housing with other social services to the territory of Nunavut? Is it going to be done in the same way that finances are transferred by the federal government to the provinces under various equalization programs or the Canada Assistance Plan?

Is it going to be a line item in the budget of the department of Indian affairs? Is it going to be on a government to government relationship where there is a system of transfer programs that go directly to the new government of Nunavut without having to go through the filtering process down at the department of Indian affairs? As the minister will know, there is going to be a lot of baggage attached to his department.

We have just seen the case in the last week or so where a predecessor in the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs defended what he did with the high Arctic exiles using the same kind of logic and the same kind of arguments that he would have used back in the 1950s. Clearly this man is still thinking in the 1950s and is being defended by his current brethren in the department of Indian affairs in order to protect his reputation of 40 years ago. There is that kind of problem in the department of Indian affairs.

One of the ways to eliminate the need for the paternalistic approach of the department of Indian affairs is to allow this territory to obtain its transfer funds and to establish its relationship with the government through federal-provincial relations. It should be some other aspect of the government, not the paternalistic agency they have been used to in the past and that is the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

In any case, my party very strongly supports the changes taking place in Canada with respect to the legislation coming down today. One is the settlement of the aboriginal land claims of the Inuit people of the eastern Arctic.

The other is the creation of a public government which in dealing with a majority of Inuit people will probably strongly reflect the views of the Inuit people living in that area. As a result, it will be a government that more clearly identifies the need and more clearly reflects the vision of those people. It will be more effective in translating those needs and those visions into the kind of action necessary to resolve their problems and take them into the future.

On behalf of my party I would like to thank all the people who were involved in the development of the new territory of Nunavut and of the land claim settlement. On behalf of my leader, the hon. member for Yukon, and on behalf of our party, we wish them all the very best of success. I know they will have success in the future. If there is any way that my party or I can assist, we look forward to being there anytime it is requested. The best of success to them.

• (1245)

Mr. Pat Nowlan (Annapolis Valley—Hants): Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the last speaker, the member for Nunatsiaq certainly, and the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development for bringing this bill, as a result of the agreement, to the floor of the House.

That is why I speak in a somewhat mixed way. The hon. member for Nunatsiaq lived through a great deal of the negotiations. Many positive things were said about this agreement by him. For all those who participated in the negotiations that produced the agreement, I do believe it is Parliament working and the process of people working with their government agencies and officials.

I speak almost with a forked tongue. That gets into the substance of the agreement I am glad to say is here today. It has to be put on the record that I am totally against the process. To have had the minister of Indian affairs speak for 18 minutes as he did in introducing this bill at second reading does not even begin to equal the 15 or 16 years it took to get the agreement. The member for Comox—Alberni said 20 or 25 years. I guess it depends on where one starts to define this very complex issue.

If there was ever an example of a dead Parliament doing dangerous things, this bill sadly is it. This bill should not have been brought in in the closing days of Parliament, the last weekend before we rise. Whether we come back, we do not know.

With all the good things the minister of Indian affairs and other speakers have said about it, this bill has the potential of nation building, of bringing the Inuit into the federation on some of the major points of the agreement.

The minister spoke this morning for 18 minutes. Then the government House leader stood up and used Standing Order 78(1) with the connivance and the complicity of the opposition and they are always railing against allocation of time.

However, an agreement of this size and magnitude should be in the public domain as a bill. The negotiations went on for 15 to 20 years, depending on the time frame used. Have that percolated and focused and then have people decide that perhaps something said in Parliament at second reading or in Committee of the Whole deserves further attention.

The rule is supposed to be used to move things along when there has been an excess of debate, when there has been obstruction. Yet we have had a horrible example in the dying days of this Parliament of the government using Standing Order 78(1) with the connivance and collusion of the opposition. In effect it says that the parties have agreed, yet other members who may not belong to political parties have not had a chance to speak out for their constituents or for other people in Canada.

We know from the history of this Parliament that this party has had no credibility on constitutional matters. There were three parties that agreed to Meech Lake some many years ago. In effect that went down the drain.

More recently we know the three major parties all got together on the Charlottetown accord. Three or four of us spoke out in a negative way on the Charlottetown accord and we were unable to get a vote then. Under the rules it is well known that five members are needed to provoke a vote and look what happened to the Charlottetown accord. The parties, the member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell and members of the three major parties, all went one way on the Charlottetown accord for the greater good of Canada. Yet the people of Canada had some misgivings, to put it kindly. The people of Canada said no to the Charlottetown accord in a referendum.

That is another reason that a government in its dying days to exercise Standing Order 78(1) to close off debate on something of such magnitude and importance to the people involved is not doing justice to the issue.

• (1250)

That is why I certainly agree with the point of order that was raised in a very short period of time. Under the rules we cannot get into debate when Standing Order 78(1) is used. The member for Beaver River did raise a point of order about the process. I had just stepped outside; I was on the phone. I came back in and found out the government House leader had used it.

Members of the opposition, whether Liberal or the NDP, are always protesting with vigour how they have been raped by allocation or closure. Yet when they are not gored they will get into bed with the government. It was never intended to be that way. This is the second time in the last month the government has used Standing Order 78(1).

The earlier matter, and certainly the one I was associated with, was the Elections Act which affected all members. They were able to use it because there were only four or five members in the House.

However, on this one I feel sad for the hon. member for Nunatsiaq who made a great speech and the people in the gallery who have lived this. This should not be snuck in as though people are ashamed of the deal. It should have been given a proper debate and historic debate.

Mr. Speaker, you are from the west. The provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta entered Confederation in 1905. You can go through the *Hansard* for that time. I am not going to take time doing so because my time is limited.

The member from Comox—Alberni started. According to the table we have exactly one hour and 13 minutes left to pass this bill on the basis of this rather complicated agreement; one hour and 13 minutes from the time the member from Comox—Alberni started, to pass this bill in all stages including Committee of the Whole consideration if we ever get to it. Then the old hammer chops and that is it.

I could compare that with what happened in earlier days. I am not going to over-dwell on it, but there was debate on Bill C-69, the Alberta Act, 1905, and debate on Bill C-70, the Saskatchewan Act, 1905. There were different indices then to get the material. Just a quick review of the index in those days when new provinces were being brought into Confederation and being made part of Canada shows that it was not done in the dying days of Parliament. It was not done on a late Friday afternoon or in the dark of night. It was done in open daylight. It had debate at first, second and third readings. There were 84 pages of index of both bills. I think 52 members participated in debate on one bill and over 52 participated in the other debate. That is what used to happen.

I say this is a perversion of the rules and I say it sadly. It is a travesty of Parliament which by its very name, as we all know, means we are supposed to speak. We are supposed to be able to speak. The government House leader stood after 18 minutes and in effect invoked closure, allocation of time. We were to have one hour and 45 minutes from when he moved that and we are now down to one hour and 13 minutes when the member from Comox—Alberni stood. It boggles the mind.

After all, as we have heard quite properly, this is a mammoth exercise by government and the people. According to the maps, some of the briefings and the material I have assembled that I think is correct, we are dealing with one-quarter the size of Canada in terms of defining a new territory. Undoubtedly and with full credit to the people of that territory, be they 16,000 or 17,000 Inuit of the total of 20,000, over time there will be an emancipation process as there should be perhaps to develop a state or a province.

We have a bill affecting one-quarter of the land mass of Canada as a result of negotiations for, I thought, 15 years or 16 years. The minister's speech does not even begin to represent one year for each of the years of negotiation. In that sense it is not doing justice to the Inuit or to Parliament because it is a travesty of Parliament to have this type of motion at this time.

There are so many questions one could ask. However this is second reading and perhaps a better time would be at Committee of the Whole if that is what we are going to do. I know some of these things have been negotiated. This should not just be done in the dying days of a Parliament but when the focus of public affairs is on many other matters. There has not been the public focus on the implications of this bill.

• (1255)

I listened to my friend's speech because I respect him very much. There were many matters that could perhaps have been examined in the brief time we have. There will be a new public service in the territory. There may be an influx from the south coming north. There may not be the majority that would presently be the majority in the territorial Government of Nunavut. There are many things.

When this was first announced as recently as 1991 Ovide Mercredi raised questions about the inherent rights of aboriginals being adversely affected by this process. There is something else that I do not think many appreciate. It was part of the give and take and one of the reasons we were able to get an agreement. The creation of this bill, for the first time as I understand it, actually transfers the land ownership. I am not talking about aboriginal title. I am talking about the actual land ownership over a good section of this land. It affects all Canadians because until now all Canadians north and south of 60 have had an interest through the Crown in that land. I am just not sure where the interests of Canadians from coast to coast north of 60 lie under this bill.

There are many other matters that could be mentioned. I do not even know where the implementation agreement is. Is the bill we will be debating after passing Bill C-133 the implementation agreement that was supposed to be here as a condition precedent before this bill was to be ratified? There are different elements of the ratification processes for Parliament, not for the Inuit who have had their ratification and their votes. That is something I wondered about. Perhaps we can deal with it in Committee of the Whole.

I give compliments to the minister because it has been a trying experience. I have not shared a lot of the general criticism that the minister has had in his department, because it is a very tough department. I frankly think he has handled it fairly well with all the difficulties of not just this bill but of many other matters.

I am very saddened he felt it necessary to speak in the ear of old jack hammer government House leader or jackboot House leader, the member from Calgary or from wherever. He invoked Standing Order 78(1) to cut off debate on something of such magnitude when we should have been singing hosannas as we found out more about the details of the agreement.

I think we could move it along to Committee of the Whole because of the process and because I feel so strongly about the process regardless of the subject matter. You are indicating, Mr. Speaker, that my time is almost up. I hope I am here to say no, as perhaps my friend from Beaver River would have done, when this bill is called for second reading. I feel strongly that this was the wrong tactic to use on something so fundamentally important for the people affected. It certainly is a poor reflection of the state of this Parliament. The sooner we can have an election and have a variety of parties in the House, the sooner we will not have the conspiracy of silence, the Official Opposition and the NDP agreeing with a government that they usually condemn every day.

Ever so often on a Friday afternoon they get in bed with them and commit political incest. That is what the opposition parties have done. I do not want to hear them protesting any more about allocation of time when they happen not to like it.

Hon. Thomas Siddon (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I certainly respect and have listened carefully to the comments of my colleague from Annapolis Valley—Hants on this issue.

The clock is running under the provisions of the motion adopted earlier this day under Standing Order 78(1). However this would be the appropriate point at which to respond to the concern the hon. member has expressed about the shortness of time.

This land claim agreement has been under negotiation for about the same length of time the hon. member has sat in the House. Perhaps he has not been here quite that long. In that period he has witnessed many debates on aboriginal issues and has seen the passage of important land claims legislation in the past.

• (1300)

The first point I would submit is that it would be a tragedy if Parliament could not complete the work begun so many years ago, in particular given the will and the dedication not only of the TFN and the Inuit people but of the territorial government and the federal government to settle this matter now.

I understand the hon. member's concern about the shortness of time, but the life of this Parliament is very short and there is also important business to be transacted in the next few remaining days. With the co-operation of the two official opposition parties, the majority of the members in this House has expressed the will to have this piece of business done.

While I respect the view of the hon. member I would point out it was three years ago on April 30 that I signed the agreement in principle. All members of the House through parliamentary committees have had a chance to follow the development of this legislative package. I appeared before the standing committee in the month of February and was questioned extensively. Some members present were there for over three hours while we went through the elements of this agreement.

The Inuit ratified the agreement last November. Drafting and language translation were required, but I must point out to the hon. member that it was only on Tuesday of this week that the final overlap matter was resolved with the co-operation of some members of the House. It was only last Tuesday that it was possible for the Prime Minister to sign because there was a matter before the courts until three weeks ago.

It is not simply a matter of saying we should have done this earlier or we might take a little longer. Time has run out. A large group of people in the gallery feel it is now time for the Parliament of Canada to do its duty and adopt Bill C-133 and the companion legislation which we will come to momentarily, Bill C-132.

I would plead with the hon. member to understand that this is an extraordinary circumstance, but it is an extraordinarily wonderful opportunity for the people of Canada to do something good; to reach out to the Inuit who, after all, for thousands of years have managed and husbanded that wonderful territory, their land they call Nunavut; and to accommodate that in this legislation.

I might point out the hon. member has had since last Friday when first reading occurred and the bill was tabled to study this bill. He was offered briefings. He was given a briefing, I gather, by the Tungavik Federation of Nunavut in recent days. I hope he will be prepared to focus on the essence of the bill so we might get on with passing it and Bill C-132 today.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Does the hon. member want to comment on the minister's remarks?

Mr. Nowlan: Yes, Mr. Speaker, just very briefly. If there is another question I will take it in the short time for comments.

I understand what the minister explained and I gave him some credit. We had discussions yesterday as the minister well knows. I am sorry about the position I am in because of the Standing Order 78(1) closure motion.

After the discussion yesterday and knowing that some of it happened very recently, I thoroughly expected the proper thing would be to have the debate. I not surprised with the turn-out in the House on a Friday afternoon we could have got into second reading without a closure motion, had exchanges on certain questions and the matter would have still proceeded. If it did not get through this Friday, I certainly feel with the Prime Minister taking such an active interest, and with the consistent interest of the minister, it is not be beyond the realm of probability or possibility that there could be third reading debate and a vote next week in the extended hours we will have then.

The minister speaks very sweet language. He has worked with this and I give him credit. In his own speech he said he was very happy when it was finally consummated. I am saddened that from his work and the Prime Minister flying north the parliamentary process as far as I am concerned has been abused in trying to do a good thing.

• (1305)

Mr. Jack Iyerak Anawak (Nunatsiaq):

[*Editor's Note: Member spoke in Inuktitut*]

[*English*]

I would like to just make a very brief comment to the hon. member from Annapolis Valley. As a member of Parliament for the area concerned, as a beneficiary under the claims and as a representative for all the people who will be benefiting from this agreement, I have absolutely no hesitation in stating here that we have no problem whatsoever with the tactics that were taken earlier today to limit the debate in order to get this very important bill for the Inuit of Nunavut passed today.

I say to my colleague that it is the Inuit who approved and ratified the agreement, and consequently the bill was presented in this House on Friday. A great majority of the Inuit in the eastern Arctic ratified the agreement.

I have absolutely no hesitation in saying let the bill go through third reading and be passed and sent to the other House today.

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, to reinforce the point just made by my colleague, the distinguished member of Parliament for Nunatsiaq, this is one of those rare occasions in this House where there is consensus on every side of the House and on the part of every political party. Therefore there is a desire to see this proposal go forward. The time allocated may not even be fully taken up, who knows, by the time we conclude. We will see.

I would only like to make the following brief remarks. My first remark is that Bill C-133 is an historical bill and therefore this is an historical day and an historical step. It contains a decision of enormous importance for the Inuit. It is a chance for them to participate as partners in the development of their homeland, as the member for Nunatsiaq already very eloquently put it.

It is an agreement that shows the desire by the Inuit people to achieve self-determination. It is a measure and a law that will at least give some control or will re-establish, to use the actual words of the member for Nunatsiaq, some control by the Inuit people over their own affairs. It is therefore a very enlightened initiative.

Therefore there is nothing wrong in complimenting the minister and the government for having taken this step. We all see this as a very positive initiative.

By way of background, it is important to also see the geographic magnitude. The Nunavut will cover an area that is one-fifth of that of Canada, some two million square kilometres. It has a population of some 22,000 people, of which 17,500 or so are Inuit. It has a mean temperature in January of minus 35 Celsius and a mean temperature in July of plus 10 Celsius. It has a population per square kilometre of one, compared to a population of 20 to 25 per square kilometre in the rest of Canada.

It is blessed by one great thing for someone like me who comes from Toronto. It has only 20 kilometres of highway. Imagine that. This is a sign of high civilization. These are people who know how to move around without polluting their environment.

One of the things that strikes the visitor is to find out that one litre of milk can cost up to $4, one loaf of bread can cost anywhere from $2.50 to $3, and a kilo of potatoes can cost as much as $2 to $3.

• (1310)

The cost of living in the Arctic and in the Nunavut territory is extremely high. That fact emphasizes the importance of ensuring that the natural resources of Nunavut are conserved, protected and made available to the present and expanded future population so that the Inuit people can continue to draw from the land the nourishment they need without having to depend more and more on imported food.

The member for Nunatsiaq also made a very interesting reference to the land, the waters and the wildlife and the fact that the Inuit people are not separate from their environment. They are part of it and they consider the environment to be part of their culture. This is a very impressive way of defining their life and it is an attitude from which we non-Inuit could learn.

The member for Nunatsiaq went on to say that the land claim negotiations are seen by non-aboriginal people as a real estate transaction and this is not the view of the Inuit people because for them it is difficult to understand the non-aboriginal concept of individual land title and ownership.

They have a far better concept than the one we have. I do not believe that land belongs to anyone. We can rent the land while we are on this earth and we can use it, but basically the land belongs to the environment. If we were to borrow this concept from the Inuit people I think we would treat the land with much greater respect and we would have many fewer problems in the environment than we are facing now, particularly with regard to the disposal of waste.

I think it is a far superior concept to see this transaction not as an individual land title and ownership transaction but as a way of ensuring that there is a relationship with the land from which people draw their livelihood. This is highly commendable and a concept from which we could learn a lot.

The member for Nunatsiaq also stressed the importance for Canadians to understand that there is a tremendous power imbalance that exists in these negotiations between the aboriginal people on the one hand and the federal government on the other. The federal government makes the rules, it can change the rules and it can even break the rules. It has the money, all the expertise and armies of bureaucrats at its disposal. He put it very well. That is the history. The aboriginal negotiators, on the other hand, do not have access to all of these resources.

The motive and intention is to ensure a better future for present and future generations of children. We understand and respect this long-term concept. In looking at the agreement I am glad to see that it has a strong article 5 on wildlife and that it has a fairly strong concept of conservation. In future this concept could possibly be strengthened, particularly article 5.1.5(a) which says that one of the principles of conservation is:

> the maintenance of the natural balance of ecological systems within the Nunavut Settlement Area.

Maybe it is more than a question of balance. It is a question of the indispensable recognition that conservation and natural resources are the pre-condition for survival in the Arctic.

I was glad to read about the establishment of a Nunavut wildlife management board. I share the concern already expressed by the member for Nunatsiaq that there may be far too many structures, but let us hope that these structures will be positive and will not become bureaucratic and self-serving.

There is an excellent article 8 on parks. I fully support article 8.3.4, which speaks about the involvement of the Inuit people. It is absolutely essential that the process of the planning and administration of the parks in the Arctic be accelerated in terms of making it one that is administered and run by the Inuit people themselves.

• (1315)

This concept was established some 10 to 15 years ago. I am glad to see that the government has continued along that path. All I would urge is that this process be accelerated so that one day under Nunavut administration all of the parks in the Nunavut portion of the Arctic will be administered by the Inuit people, thereby creating jobs for them.

Article 9 on conservation areas is also a good one. I was glad to see that it was so thoroughly expanded. I wish that part 9 of article 11, which deals with waste clean-up, could have been stronger. I wish that it could have been more detailed. I am glad that it deals with the abandoned DEW line sites. Perhaps in future documents, reference will be made to the importance of tackling the pollution coming from the south, namely from the industrial parts of Canada, the United States and Mexico.

Pollution does not know boundaries. It does not respect boundaries. The Arctic and the Nunavut territory are constantly the recipient of transboundary pollution which is considerably harming, as we all know, wildlife and the health of the animals both in water and on land. As a result of harvesting it is used by humans and will eventually settle in human tissue.

The question of waste clean-up is important on land within Nunavut but also needs to be addressed in terms of transboundary pollution in the future.

I was glad to read part 6 of article 12 with regard to the federal environmental assessment panel. I wish only to express the hope that future governments will when they receive the conclusion and recommendations of federal environmental assessments also respect them and implement them in their decisions.

In schedule 12-1 there is a list of types of projects proposed as being exempt from screening. After a cursory read I found that list a bit too big. I wish the exemptions could be narrowed. I hope that through experience and as the years go by this fairly long list of exemptions could be reduced.

Article 15 deals with marine areas. I did not have the time to study it or the balance of the document in depth.

In conclusion, Nunavut will require a very good and highly motivated environmental policy. Since we know that energy plays such a major role in the quality of the environment I would take the liberty of urging that the Nunavut develop a very advanced energy policy for the use of its population.

The challenge is to reduce the dependence from very expensive fuel oil that is brought in every year by sea lift. From Iqaluit to Grise Fjord the cost of oil brought in every year is immense. There are alternative sources through wind power and even through solar power. They are still not competitive but they will soon be competitive. I think that Nunavut could become a model of ways to demonstrate to the rest of the world community how it can be done and how it is possible to shift gradually over the years from dependence on fossil fuels to renewable sources of energy. The technology is there. It is still not competitive, as I said, but it can be done. In the long term actually the cost can be amortized very well and the future therefore looks rather promising.

• (1320)

It seems to me from my limited knowledge of the Inuit people and of Nunavut that the ultimate goal of this agreement and this bill would be to preserve these lands ecologically in good quality and in good condition forever for all the generations still to be born. We do that from the recognition that basically the economic well-being of the Inuit people depends on a healthy and strong environment. So long as that pre-condition is established, then this bill will have probably fulfilled its implicit purpose.

For those who have visited the eastern Arctic this is a most beautiful part of the globe. It commands respect and admiration. Therefore we are in a way very proud to be part of this process here today because it holds great hopes for generations to come.

Mr. Ray Funk (Prince Albert—Churchill River): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to rise in this House on this historic occasion and add my sentiments to this debate and particularly to associate myself with the remarks of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, the member for Nunatsiaq and the member for Comox—Alberni.

I have the privilege of representing one of the overlapping groups, the Denesuline of northern Saskatchewan, in this House of Commons. I would have liked to make more extensive remarks in this particular debate. I will however reserve those remarks because the next bill is of a very similar content to this one and I think those remarks can be appropriately made there. I would like to save enough time to ask the minister a few questions during Committee of the Whole.

With that I would just like to say that this is an historic occasion. Canada is changing profoundly because of what we are doing here today. I appreciate being here for this event.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, considered in committee and reported.

• (1325)

Hon. Thomas Siddon (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development) moved that the bill be concurred in.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Siddon moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.

* * *

NUNAVUT ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

Hon. Thomas Siddon (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development) moved that Bill C-132, an act to establish a territory to be known as Nunavut and provide for its government and to amend certain acts in consequence thereof, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee in the Human Resources envelope.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to address the House a second time on this important historic day to deal with the transformation that is under way in our relationship with the Inuit of the eastern Arctic.

Bill C-132 which has just been read the second time is entitled an act to create the territory of Nunavut. What we will be discussing for the next hour or so is the political development of a new legislative assembly in the eastern Arctic, a commitment that ties to the Nunavut land claims settlement agreement which we have just passed through third reading in this House.

It has long been a goal of the Inuit of Nunavut to have their own territorial assembly or government and not be tied to the government of the Northwest Territories. Article 4 of the Nunavut land claim settlement agreement establishes a commitment on the part of the federal government to recommend to Parliament the establishment of a Nunavut territory.

• (1330)

The land claim agreement and as well the political accord setting out the means of establishing Nunavut have already been signed. Indeed after the ratification vote on October 31 of last year, as we have already recognized in this House, the Inuit of the eastern Arctic ratified the creation of Nunavut by a very strong majority. I think it was 85 per cent of those who voted on that date endorsed the creation of Nunavut.

As well the people of the Northwest Territories have held two referenda on this question. This was most recently in the spring of 1992 when the question was put by the decision of the assembly of the Northwest Territories and with the sanction of the government leader and cabinet. The question was put to all the people of the Northwest Territories with respect to the western boundary line of the Nunavut settlement agreement being adopted as a new political boundary to establish Nunavut on the eastern side of that line.

I remember the night here in Ottawa, I think it was December 15, 1991, when we had a long and fruitful discussion about whether the federal government had the will to make this commitment which we are about to endorse today. I remember in a sense taking a risk but I did in fact call the Prime Minister and we decided that we could make that commitment which is reflected in article 4 of the land claim agreement. It led to the negotiation of the political accord which I spoke of a moment ago and the ratification vote by the people of Nunavut.

The legislation before us today will literally redraw the map of northern Canada. As well this bill will provide for a new and improved political and economic future for the Inuit of the eastern Arctic. In so doing it will bring benefit to all Canadians.

[*Translation*]

I seek the support of distinguished members on both sides of this House today, because I am confident their support will be forthcoming.

I have every reason to believe that my colleagues will have the vision and foresight to approve this bill, so that the Inuit and other residents in the north will be able to build a better future.

The Nunavut political accord was signed on October 30, 1992, and it will become effective once the legislation before the House today, Bill C-132, is passed.

The creation of a new territory, with its own government, has been a fundamental objective of the Inuit of Nunavut for more than 20 years. An act of Parliament is required to make this dream come true.

I would like to point out that Bill C-132 was drafted with the close co-operation of the Government of the Northwest Territories and the Tungavik Federation of Nunavut, to ensure that it reflects the objectives and intent of the Nunavut political accord.

• (1335)

[*English*]

Bill C-132 provides for the creation of a new territory, Nunavut, translated in Inuktitut meaning "our land", new institutions of government similar to those of the existing territories and will come into effect by 1999 on April 1.

This legislation provides for a transition process to lead us to that point. This will not be a form of aboriginal self-government in the usual ethnic sense of the word. It will be a public government to be elected and fully responsible to all the residents of the new territory, aboriginal and non-aboriginal alike.

Nevertheless given the Inuit predominance in the region this new public government will naturally reflect and be responsive to their aspirations and ways of doing things.

Bill C-132 is modelled on the Northwest Territories Act which has existed for many years. By this bill the act is modernized and adapted specifically for the needs of the people of Nunavut.

I want to draw members' attention to some of the key features contained in Bill C-132. In keeping with the terms of the political accord, Bill C-132 will provide for the creation of a Nunavut implementation commission. This is an important feature because we are talking about a transitional process.

This commission independent of the governments and of the people of Nunavut through the Nunavut Tungavik will advise the governments of Canada and the Northwest Territories along with the successor to TFN to be called Nunavut Tungavik on a range of issues.

A majority of the commission's members will be residents of the Nunavut region. I believe it will be six of nine. The governments of Tungavik will share equally in nominating members of the commission with the other governments, the Government of the Northwest Territories and the Government of Canada in establishing the commission.

We intend to establish the commission in the near future. Indeed the bill provides that it must be established within six months of granting royal assent. The commission will continue its critical role until it is disbanded no later than three months after the creation of the new territory. When Nunavut is created it will have a commissioner as is the case in Yukon and the Northwest Territories. That would be after 1999.

In the past commissioners for the territories have often wielded considerable powers. In recent years as responsible government in the north has grown the office of the commissioner has become largely symbolic. Some would say it has evolved to a lieutenant governor–like function.

This new role is reflected in the Nunavut bill. Bill C–132 also provides for the creation of an executive council for Nunavut. This council will be similar to a provincial executive council or cabinet and will be appointed by the commissioner on the advice of the legislative assembly of Nunavut. This is a reflection of the way in which the cabinet is currently appointed in Northwest Territories.

The new territorial government will have a comparable range of law making powers now enjoyed by other territorial governments. In addition the Nunavut act specifically provides that the Nunavut legislature may pass laws to implement the Nunavut land claim agreement and to preserve and enhance the Inuktitut language.

• (1340)

Nunavut will have the authority to enter into agreements with the federal and provincial governments and will be authorized to manage and sell public lands that are under the care of the commissioner.

I should also point out that there will be an interim commissioner established during the transitional period to begin to prepare for the establishment officially of the office of commissioner after 1999 and to begin to exercise commissioner–like authorities in the transitional period.

Hon. members should also be aware that Bill C–132 makes necessary consequential amendments to other federal legislation. These are essentially housekeeping amendments to reflect the division of the current Northwest Territories into two separate territories.

Bill C–132 will also move the government down the road to achieving its vision for the north, a vision of social and economic development that respects the environment and that first and foremost brings benefit to the residents of Nunavut.

There have been questions about the costs and the necessity of this government. Perhaps we will have an opportunity to discuss that during the Committee of the Whole. I would like to suggest that there is always an appropriate form of government to be found which best suits the needs of a people.

It seems rather obvious to me that a government in Yellowknife or Ottawa comprised of non–Inuit people is not the best government located 2,000 or more miles away to serve the interests and purposes of the Inuit people.

There is an appropriate structure of government to be established within our traditions of Parliament, a government which will be largely comprised of Inuit people who are the majority in that area and whose children will become the architects and the beneficiaries of the authorities which that government will exercise into the next century.

This legislation provides for initial powers to be established in 1999 involving a territorial assembly, a—forgive me the word—bureaucracy and a court. Over the period between there and the year 2008 there will be other powers and authorities added as it becomes appropriate to devolve or relocate those powers from Yellowknife or Ottawa where they presently reside.

I think this is an eminently logical approach. I should say, in regard to the question of cost, Canadians cannot afford to continue the cost of an insensitive system which is remote from the needs of the people. Canadians cannot afford not to support the creation of Nunavut. I believe with the kind of wisdom, the persistence and the practical creativity of the Inuit people who have existed all of those centuries in Nunavut, we will see an appropriate form of government established which will not be a burden to other Canadians but indeed something which we can all celebrate.

Before I sit, I should pay a debt of gratitude to the negotiators who served the federal and territorial governments so well. I will not name them right now, but perhaps there will be a moment toward the end of the debate. However, I do want to name here and to recognize in the gallery Mr. Paul Quassa, Mr. Louis Pilakapsi, Mr. James Eetoolook and other members of the Board of the Tungavik Federation of Nunavut, together with those who have guided this process in other ways such as John Amagoalik, Jack Anawak, if I might be permitted to name a member, Thomas Suluk, Rosemary Kuptana, Dennis Patterson, Titus Allooloo.

The people of Nunavut have been the architects of this transformation.

• (1345)

While it might be unconventional I would like to ask Mr. Quassa and Pauloosie Keyootak, the representatives here today, to stand and be recognized by the House of Commons in view of their wonderful contribution in a new partnership with Canada.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Siddon: I have enjoyed a wonderful relationship with some people who have become genuine friends and have shown me the way to find a better future for Canada.

I sense that you might find within the House the disposition to agree at this stage to proceed through all stages and to conclude this day before we rise the adoption at third reading of Bill C–132, the Nunavut Act.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is there unanimous consent of the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Agreed and so ordered.

Mr. Jack Iyerak Anawak (Nunatsiaq): Before I get to my comments I would also like to acknowledge the support of people like Raymond Ningeocheak, Pauloosie Keyootak, Joe Allen Evyagotailak, Rhoda Inukshuk, the former President of Inuit Tapirisat of Canada whom I omitted for no reason but forgetfulness. They have worked very hard toward the negotiations.

I would also like to acknowledge the ongoing support I received from my family who are in the audience from our smallest to the oldest. I acknowledge their support.

I want to comment on the minister's comment can we afford not to. It reminds me of the commercial can we afford not to? I think that is the question. I cannot remember which commercial, but can we afford not to? Canadians should be asking themselves that in getting Nunavut as part of the Canadian federation.

As I said earlier, it is a real honour to be here today to speak on the Nunavut bill, Bill C–132. This is the bill that will create the new territory of Nunavut. This bill flows from the land claim agreement. Article 4 of the agreement in principle signed in April 1990 committed the parties to the political development of Nunavut.

The article committed the Government of Canada, the Government of the Northwest Territories and the Tungavik Federation of Nunavut, on behalf of the Inuit of Nunavut, to the creation of a Nunavut territory, and the financing of a Nunavut government, outside of the claims agreement, as soon as possible.

It is important to note that the commitment to create the Nunavut territory is outside of the claims agreement. Government policy would not allow the Inuit to negotiate the political development of Nunavut within their land claim agreement.

[*Translation*]

Nevertheless, the government support for Nunavut, even though outside the land claim agreement, was a key victory for Inuit. Without this commitment to Nunavut, Inuit were not prepared to settle their land claim. Settlement of the land claim depended on obtaining the commitment to Nunavut.

[*English*]

Article 4 of the agreement in principle also committed the parties to a territory-wide plebiscite on a boundary for division, and an agreement on the division of powers.

That plebiscite was held, a boundary was approved and the Nunavut political accord was signed.

Flowing from all these prior decisions and agreements is the bill before us now, Bill C–132, the act to establish the new Nunavut territory. This is a proud and historic moment for me and for all the Inuit of Nunavut.

• (1350)

As I noted in my earlier speech on the land claims bill, I do not believe that ever before in this House has a member of Parliament spoken in such a capacity, both as a representative for the region concerned and as a beneficiary of the land claims agreement to which this bill is tied. It is a very special feeling for me and today is a very special day. This is a proud and historic moment for the people of Canada.

What we are doing here today is welcoming a new partner into the Canadian federation.

[*Translation*]

I want to congratulate and thank the people of Nunavut for their vision and for their determination to achieve that vision. I also want to thank all the people of the Northwest Territories who supported our aspirations by voting with us in the plebiscite a year ago. The dream of Nunavut, of getting recognition of our Inuit homeland, and recognition of our right to participate in the government and development of that homeland is a dream that goes back many, many years.

I remember a meeting of the Inuit Tapirisat in 1975 in Tuktoyaktuk at which we were discussing a name for our new territory. I moved the motion at that meeting to call the new territory Nunavut. In English, Nunavut means "our land". That motion was adopted, and now here I am today, 18 years later, speaking on the bill that will recognize the Nunavut territory.

[*English*]

For the benefit of non-Inuit, Inuit means "the people" and I repeat that Nunavut means "our land".

I want Canadians, including members of this House, to understand that Nunavut exists now and has always existed in the minds and hearts of Inuit. We know Nunavut is our land. What we have been seeking throughout the years is the acknowledgement by the Canadian government that this was, and is, our land and that we have the right to control what happens to that land, our homeland.

This bill, the Nunavut act, does not give us Nunavut. However this bill does give us Canada's acknowledgement and Canada's legal recognition of the reality we have always known. It also gives us the opportunity to participate in the government of our land on terms we have helped to develop. This is very important.

[*Translation*]

When the non-Inuit arrived in our homeland, when Canada was confederated, no one asked us for our opinion. No one asked for our consent to the terms of union. No one asked us for our advice. No one asked us how we felt.

Foreign governments and foreign laws and foreign regulations were imposed on us. For years we have lived with the burden of an alien system.

With the establishment of Nunavut, we hope we will finally be able to get out from underneath what has been imposed upon us. For Inuit, the Nunavut political accord and this Nunavut bill are essentially our terms of union, the framework for our entry into the Canadian federation.

[*English*]

We want to be able to control our destiny by making our own laws and regulations. We want the chance to make our own mistakes and learn from them.

• (1355)

We want to contribute our unique knowledge, skills and talents to the building and strengthening of this nation. The creation of the Nunavut territory gives us the opportunity to do this. I want to talk for a short while about the history behind this bill and the concept of two territories instead of one in the Northwest Territories.

It seems to be the fate of the Northwest Territories to be continually divided. The province of Manitoba was created from the Northwestern Territory in 1870. The Yukon was established in 1898 and the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta were carved out in 1905. The current Northwest Territories is what remained after the creation of all those other jurisdictions. However it is still a huge area. It encompasses fully one-third of the land mass of Canada.

Further division of the existing Northwest Territories is not a new idea. It is an idea that has been around for a long time. It is an idea whose time has finally come.

For the record this is not the first time this House has seen a bill to divide the Northwest Territories. In 1963

the federal government of the day tabled a bill to divide the Northwest Territories but it did not get passed.

[*Translation*]

The people of the central, eastern and high Arctic have always felt isolated from the western part of the Northwest Territories. There are very real differences between east and west that can only be appreciated by the people who live there.

As I mentioned earlier, the Northwest Territories is one-third of the land mass of Canada. If one looks at a map of Canada, east of the border with the Yukon and south of the 60th parallel, five provinces fit under the same area covered by the Northwest Territories. The difficulties and complexities involved in administering one-third of Canada as one single jurisdiction are enormous. Variety, differences, and distance characterize the existing Northwest Territories.

The Indian and Inuit peoples of the Northwest Territories are different peoples. Their histories, cultures and languages are different. The Dene homeland, Denendeh, is in the western Arctic, whereas the Inuit of Nunavut live in the east and along the coasts. The geography is different between east and west, the wildlife is different and the lifestyles are different. As a result of these many differences, there has always been a strong push by the aboriginal peoples of the Northwest Territories for governments that are closer and more responsive to them and for governments that respect and reflect their cultures.

[*English*]

Numerous proposals for division and political development have been put forward over the years by Inuit, Dene and non-aboriginal people. The existing government of the Northwest Territories has been involved in many of these efforts. The people of the NWT have also been fully involved.

On April 14, 1982, 56 per cent of NWT voters in the territorial plebiscite supported division. In May 1992 NWT voters supported the boundary line for division, which is reflected in this bill. It is the land claim boundary line.

I want Canadians to get a good understanding of how far away the seat of the existing territorial government is from the people in the eastern Arctic.

• (1400)

Currently, if people live in the Baffin region, say in Broughton Island or Pangnirtung they live north of Montreal, Quebec but their territorial capital is in Yellowknife, north of Edmonton, Alberta. No other Canadian citizen has to deal with a capital city that is the equivalent of four or five provinces away.

With the establishment of the Nunavut territory we hope to establish a capital and a government that are closer to the people.

That is just part of the hope of Nunavut. There is much more promise here but there is also much challenge.

[*Translation*]

I want now to turn my attention to the substance of this bill. This bill provides a framework for the establishment of the Nunavut territory. Much hard work is yet to come.

Under this bill, Nunavut will not be created tomorrow. The government of Nunavut will be established over time, gradually taking over powers, programs and services at a pace it is to determine itself. In 1999 the first legislative assembly of the new Nunavut territory will be elected. Assumption of the full range of territorial powers is not foreseen until the year 2008.

Initially, the Nunavut government will look very much like the existing Governments of the Northwest Territories and Yukon. It will have an elected legislative assembly, a cabinet and a territorial court.

[*English*]

The government of Nunavut will be a public government, open to the participation of all residents, Inuit and non-Inuit. The legislative assembly will be elected by all residents. So it is not aboriginal self-government in the sense of a government exclusively for and by aboriginal peoples.

Bill C-132 contains five parts, 79 clauses, and three schedules. Seventy-six other acts of Parliament are amended as a consequence of this bill.

Part I of the bill deals with the establishment and government of Nunavut. It covers matters such as the seat of government, the commissioner of Nunavut, the executive council of Nunavut, the legislature of Nunavut, legislative powers and judicial powers.

Part II of this bill deals with official languages, the Nunavut consolidated revenue fund, territorial accounts, lands and cultural sites and property.

Part III deals with the Nunavut implementation commission.

Part IV involves transitional provisions, expenditures and the interim commissioner of Nunavut.

Part V includes the coming into force dates and the consequential amendments.

[*Translation*]

I regret that we have not had more time to study this bill. This bill and the land claim legislation were only tabled in this House last Friday. Exactly one week has passed. This is hardly enough time to absorb all the details, and consider all the consequences.

Nevertheless, because of the importance of these bills to the people of Nunavut and to the people of Canada, all parties have agreed to fast-track them.

I hope we have not missed or overlooked anything major. I am reassured by the fact that Tungavik was involved in the drafting of these bills. If there was anything out of the ordinary, I am sure it would have been picked up.

[*English*]

In terms of the details of the bills, I want to raise a couple of areas of concern. The first involves the transition process and implementation, the second involves the funding and the third involves education and training.

Probably the most significant part of this bill is the Nunavut implementation commission. This commission will determine the face of the future government of Nunavut.

It will consist of a chairperson and nine other members. Three members will be nominated by the Government of the Northwest Territories, three will be nominated by Tungavik, and three will be nominated by the federal government. At least six of the members must be ordinarily resident in Nunavut.

The mandate of the commission is to advise the Government of Canada, the Government of the Northwest Territories and Tungavik on the establishment of Nunavut.

• (1405)

The mandate includes: (a) the timetable for the assumption by the Nunavut government of responsibility for the delivery of services; (b) the process for the first election of the Nunavut legislative assembly, including the numbers of members and the establishment of electoral districts; (c) the design and funding of training programs; (d) the process for determining the location of the capital of Nunavut; (e) the principles and the criteria for the equitable division of assets and liabilities between Nunavut and the Northwest Territories; (f) the new public works necessitated by the establishment of Nunavut and the scheduling of the construction of the works; (g) the administrative design of the first Government of Nunavut; (h) the arrangements for delivery of programs and services where these are to be phased in; and (i) any other related matter referred to it by the minister.

[*Translation*]

This is a heavy, loaded agenda. These negotiations, particularly the financial negotiations, are going to be difficult and lengthy. All parties to these negotiations, naturally, will be looking to protect their own interests. The representatives for Nunavut will have to be very vigilant. The new territory must be able to start out on the best possible footing.

I also want to deal for a moment with the transitional provisions of this bill that could establish the office of an interim commissioner of Nunavut. This individual, under the provisions of this bill, could wield a great deal of power. The bill says the federal cabinet can appoint an interim commissioner until the first commissioner is appointed.

[*English*]

The interim commissioner is to act according to written directions given to him or her by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. The minister will be able to determine the manner in which these directions are made public.

The powers of the powers include: (a) recruiting persons for employment by the government of Nunavut; (b) prescribing the duties and conditions of employment such persons; (c) establishing systems and processes for the government of Nunavut, including the organization and administration of the territorial courts; and (d) carrying out any other functions as the federal cabinet may determine.

Agreements regarding employment that are entered into by the interim commissioner will be binding on the government of Nunavut.

The government of Nunavut will, however, be able to alter, revoke or replace any systems or process of government put in place by the interim commissioner. We hope this will not be necessary.

The interim commissioner, with federal cabinet approval, will be able to enter into agreements with the Government of Canada, the Government of the Northwest Territories, the government of any province or any other body for the carrying out of programs previously carried out by the Government of the Northwest Territories.

The interim commissioner will also be able to enter into agreements with the Government of Canada or the Government of the Northwest Territories for funding in respect of Nunavut.

The interim commissioner will be able to enter into agreements with the Government of the Northwest Territories for the division of its assets and liabilities between Nunavut and the Northwest Territories. Nowhere in these sections is there any requirement for the interim commissioner to consult with the Tungavik and the people of Nunavut.

I should point out that the commissioner of Nunavut is required under this bill to make any instructions he or she receives from the federal minister or the federal cabinet available to the Nunavut cabinet. They are, furthermore, also to be given to the Nunavut legislative assembly.

Since the legislative assembly will not be constituted during the time period envisaged for the interim commissioner, the federal minister gets to decide how the instructions to the interim commissioner will be made public.

There seems to be a bit of a vacuum here. I would like the government to give some assurance of consultation with the people of Nunavut during this very important transition phase. I would like to know more about the relationship between the interim commissioner and the Nunavut implementation commission.

[*Translation*]

The second area I want to deal with concerns funding. The interim commissioner, as I just pointed, will have authority to enter into agreements with the Government of Canada and the Government of the Northwest Territories for funding during the transition period. The funding agreements he or she negotiates will terminate two years after the establishment of Nunavut on April 1, 1999, unless there is provision for an earlier termination.

Following the establishment of Nunavut, different financial arrangements will be put in place. A backgrounder prepared by the federal government indicates that as services now provided by the government of the Northwest Territories are transferred to the new Nunavut government, there will be a proportional transfer of federal funds and government positions from the Government of the Northwest Territories to the Government of Nunavut.

The government backgrounder points out that a number of studies have estimated the possible costs of establishing the new territory and Government of Nunavut, but that since the exact form and structure of the Nunavut government is yet to be determined these studies have been based on probable scenarios and assumptions.

• (1410)

[*English*]

The most recent study, by the firm of Coopers Lybrand, has estimated the cost of setting up the new government in the period from 1992 to 2008 at an average of $50 million per year, a 7 per cent increase above the 1990–91 federal formula funding grant to the existing Government of the Northwest Territories.

According to the government backgrounder, this figure includes operating costs for the Nunavut implementation, operating costs for the new government starting in 1999, as well as one–time costs for training and for the construction of government facilities. The determination of final costs for the establishment of the Nunavut government will be based on the work of the Nunavut implementation commission.

[*Translation*]

The third area I want to focus on is education and training. Success in this area is critical to the success of Nunavut. Nunavut offers great opportunities but the people of Nunavut must be in a position to take advantage of these opportunities.

Inuit education levels have improved over the past couple of decades, but we still have a long way to go. It is a sad fact that right now there are very few Inuit graduating from high school. If we do not improve further our education levels we risk being left out of the development of Nunavut. If we do not increase and upgrade our training we risk being on the sidelines.

Nunavut will generate significant employment opportunities, but Inuit must be qualified to fill these jobs. If we are not, the majority of these jobs will simply go to outsiders as they have in the past. We cannot permit this to happen. All of us must work together to ensure that the people in the communities of Nunavut benefit from the establishment of Nunavut.

We are embarked upon a long journey. Today is but a milestone along the way. We are far yet from our destination.

Passing this bill today does not change the world for us tomorrow. The lives of the people of Nunavut will not be suddenly different tomorrow or the day after or even a year from now.

[*English*]

The bill before us sets out a path to follow. It sets out a transition process, the importance of which cannot be overemphasized. Major mistakes during the transition process could prove to be serious impediments for the new government of Nunavut.

The work of the Nunavut implementation commission, as I mentioned earlier, is the key to the smooth and equitable establishment of Nunavut. I have already noted the complex and heavy mandate of this commission. The representatives of Nunavut will have to be cautious, vigilant and forward looking.

We know that when the Government of Canada transfers powers to other jurisdictions it usually does so without handing over enough resources to carry out the tasks.

A prime example that comes to mind is the health transfer agreement between the federal government and the existing Government of the Northwest Territories. The Government of the Northwest Territories is presently suing the federal government for non-payment of health bills.

Another funding problem involves housing. For the past several years the federal government has chipped away at the social housing funds it transfers to the provinces and territories. In the case of the Northwest Territories, cutbacks have been imposed over the past couple of years and recently Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation decided to altogether eliminate its cost sharing program for new social housing starting in 1994.

• (1415)

[*Translation*]

Yet there is a housing crisis in the Northwest Territories as 25 per cent of NWT households are in need and this need is growing as the population growth rate is twice the national average. Some 41 per cent of NWT children under the age of 12 are living in overcrowded housing. There is a backlog of almost 3,600 units. About half this backlog is in Nunavut.

Health and housing are major areas of concern within Nunavut. If adequate funding is not provided to deal with these needs, Nunavut will be starting out with a serious handicap.

[*English*]

In other areas, the federal government has broken financial commitments. I am thinking here of the formula financing agreement that the federal government had with the existing Government of the Northwest Territories. Several years ago the federal government unilaterally changed the formula and the Government of the Northwest Territories has received less than it should have for the past several years.

Another example involves grants in lieu of taxes. Last December the Minister of Finance announced that he was freezing these payments to municipalities. Municipal budgets had already been prepared on the assumption that the federal government would be contributing its expected share. This freeze has affected the municipality of Iqaluit.

I want the federal government to realize that when it comes to funding Nunavut, Nunavut is not like an already developed province with its own large and stable source of revenues. We are just starting out, our population is small and our people do not earn much income. Unemployment reaches 80 per cent in most communities. Nevertheless we pay taxes.

Our economy is underdeveloped. Distances between communities and from major centres in southern Canada are vast. There are no roads. Transportation costs drive up the cost of everything. Our cost of living is several times higher than the southern Canadian average, as was pointed out by my colleague from Davenport. We lack the community infrastructure and services that other Canadians take for granted. We do not have control over our resources and the Nunavut bill does not give us that control.

We need a break. We need the federal government to invest in us and our future. Give us a chance. Have faith in us. Give us the tools to manage our affairs and we will do it and we will do it well.

Invest in us and Canada will get a return that will be of long-term benefit.

[*Translation*]

Together, in partnership, we can build a better Canada for our children in which all peoples are respected. It would be a Canada in which all children have the same opportunities and where our elders can feel secure and at peace in the knowledge that the land, the people, the culture and the language are strong and will survive.

What will make Nunavut work is the people. All the people of Nunavut need to participate in the establishment of Nunavut. Everyone must get involved. Everyone must feel a part of Nunavut.

Nunavut's representatives on the Nunavut implementation commission will be carrying a very heavy burden of responsibility. They will need the help and advice of the people. It is important for the people of Nunavut to talk to them, assist them in their work and tell them what needs to be done.

For the next few moments I want to speak directly to the youth of Nunavut. I want first to express my regrets to the graduating class in Broughton Island. I had promised to be at their graduation yesterday but had to cancel so I could deal with these bills in the House today. My next words are for them and for all the youth of Nunavut.

Nunavut needs you, all of you.

I want to recognize the achievements of all the students who are graduating this year. I want to recognize the tremendous obstacles many of you have overcome to get this far. You have coped with poverty and sometimes not enough food to eat. You have coped with overcrowded housing conditions with no quiet place to study. Many of you have struggled with family responsibilities in addition to your studies. You have struggled through sickness, possibly the deaths of family members and friends, some to suicide and some of you may have even attempted suicide yourselves.

However, through it all you have kept going despite all the hard times and often without any support at all you have achieved your goal.

To those who have been discouraged and dropped out I say that they should not give up. Go back to school. Nunavut needs its own people to run it. We do not want to import all the expertise from elsewhere. We need the people of Nunavut to run the Government of Nunavut.

• (1420)

[*English*]

In closing I would just like to say that when we talk about Nunavut we speak in reverential poems about the area of Nunavut. I would just like to read a poem on how we feel about Nunavut. It is entitled "Nunavut You Hold Such Promise". I will read it:

My father died believing in you–
That you already were–that you had always been.
He thought that he had known you all along
That you had looked after him and his people since time began.

Nunavut you hold such promise.
My mother spoke of you as she sewed
And told the stories of long ago
That taught us young ones
That we would be protected

Nunavut you hold such promise.
My grandmother spoke of you
In her soft, lilting voice
As she sang us to sleep
Content to know of you

Nunavut you hold such promise.
My uncle smiled as he spoke of your bounty
On the trail, near the coast, in the hills
As he drew on his old pipe
And captured our imagination

Nunavut you hold such promise.
My small ones spoke of you too
Curiously, asking what you were
And why we all spoke of you
In quiet, respectful tones

Nunavut you hold such promise.
And I must ensure that all that I know–
All you are–must be known as I know it
So that the ones that spring from me
Will grasp your gift of wonder

Nunavut you hold such promise.
Guide me as you have guided many.
Comfort me, lead me, show me
What it is I must come to know
I shall listen, watch and learn

Nunavut you hold such promise.
My family knew you and knew you would provide
My memories of you are many
As my memories of them are precious
And now I speak of you as they did

Nunavut you hold such promise.
If we could only remember the lessons
Entangled with the memories
And take care of the stories
And pass on the wisdom

Nunavut you hold such promise.
For you are something that has been
A part of us for so long
We cannot remember when we first met
But know you will walk with us tomorrow.

Mr. Robert E. Skelly (Comox—Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief.

I appreciated the opportunity to hear the remarks of the member for Nunatsiaq and the experience he has from which his eloquence is derived. I think he really made a tremendous contribution on this piece of legislation today.

I simply want the House to know that the New Democratic Party will be supporting this legislation.

I have perhaps one concern and maybe it is not a concern at all. When we negotiate to set up a new government and a new territory it seems to bear the cultural stamp of the one we left here in Ottawa which again bears the cultural stamp of the one which was derived from Great Britain in Gothic cathedrals, more like a European model than a North American model. In fact some of us North Americans still have difficulty living within the cultural constraints of this place that is two sword lengths apart between the government side and the opposition side.

• (1425)

There are a lot of things in this type of parliamentary and government structure that do not even make sense to us who are modern Canadians living 400 or 500 years remote from the time in which this institution was established. Many of us would like to bring it up to date and more culturally in line with the way North Americans think, act and believe.

I am a little bit worried that we have taken the cookie cutter approach and decided as Lord Simcoe I think once said that we are going to take the image and transcript of what we do here and perhaps try to plant it in the new territory of Nunavut. I hope that there might be some flexibility on the part of the people who have drafted and will pass this legislation to allow the people of Nunavut to put their own cultural stamp on their legislative and government institutions so that they do not necessarily reflect the kind of institutions we are trying to pass on to them from here in Ottawa.

If there is that kind of flexibility in the legislation, then I definitely am prepared to support it and I know that our party will support it. Again, we look forward to the successful implementation of a public government in the territory of Nunavut over the next six or seven years.

Mr. Ray Funk (Prince Albert—Churchill River): Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to participate in the debate on Bill C-132 which establishes the new territory of Nunavut.

Truly it is an historic event when we as parliamentarians get to witness the establishment of a new kind of government over one-fifth of the land area of our country. The creation of this territory fundamentally changes the dynamics of this country in ways which we will only come to know gradually over the generations, but truly it is a turning point in our history.

I would also like to take the opportunity to pay tribute to the people whose vision, foresight and leadership have made this possible, not only today but over the last 17 years. A lot of people have been very patient. Many people have spent a lot of money and have been separated from their families and so on for long periods of time to make this happen.

I would also like to pay tribute to the role of the Inuit people in the history of Canada because although this is a public territory we are creating, I profoundly hope that the majority of people in Nunavut remain Inuit people for time immemorial. I hope this is a government and a territory which will be truly theirs.

First I would pay tribute to the member for Nunatsiaq. His efforts in educating us as to the realities of Nunavut and of his people have truly been exemplary. His co-operation in working out the many difficulties that have stood in the way have been a model for all of us. I very much appreciated the amount of speaking he did in his own language because representing aboriginal people myself I know how much aboriginal people, and especially the elders, value hearing their leaders speak in their own languages. I was listening hard and I thought maybe I could learn a few words over the course of the afternoon, but I do not think I will try it.

As well I have had dealings with the Inuit people and their organizations as the critic for co-operative and community development in my party. The co-operative model of development where people work together, pool their resources, work in the self-help and democratic kind of way, has been developed by the Inuit people to a larger extent than virtually any other people in this country. Many of the economic, social and artistic successes that that community enjoys are because of being able to work co-operatively. I hope this provides a model for the way the new government of Nunavut and the people of Nunavut will conduct their business in the future. That would be part of the model which all of the rest of us could learn from.

I would also like to pay tribute to the Inuit leadership which is here in the gallery today. I have not had the opportunity to get to know enough Inuit people over the years—I have met a few—to know whether they are representative of the community in general, but I suspect they are. It has been a real pleasure to get to know these people and to deal with them. To have the government of Nunavut represented by people like that I think will add a positive new dimension to our national life.

• (1430)

I would be remiss if I did not comment on some of the other people who have been involved in this debate, particularly the Dene people. They are the Denesuline of Saskatchewan who I represent and those of Manitoba and the territories.

The Dene people are among the most isolated people in Canada geographically. Through no fault or decision of their own they are divided by geography as well as political boundaries. There are no roads between their communities. There are no scheduled airline services between their communities. There are hardly even telecommunications services between their communities.

At the same time, they are divided politically by the boundaries of other people that place them in the Northwest Territories, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba. All of that has made it very difficult for the Dene people to coalesce as a people and to participate in many of the discussions and developments which directly affect them. Certainly the negotiations around the creation of Nunavut are a prime example of that.

In large part due to their isolation, the Dene people are also among the most traditional people in Canada. There are many people in those communities for whom English is a second language. Many people in their forties, fifties and certainly the elders do not know the English language at all. That has created another barrier toward active participation in the discussions that so profoundly shape their lives.

The Dene people can and do point with pride to the fact that they too have had use and occupancy over one corner of the Nunavut territory for a long period of time.

Certainly when Samuel Hearne led the first fur traders into that territory it was Dene people who were there and who helped facilitate the contact between the fur traders and the Inuit people. That is a historical fact that is well known.

As a result of the discussions and negotiations that have proceeded and the Dene concern about what might be happening to their treaty and aboriginal rights there have been land use and occupancy studies done that indicate to this day the Dene do use and occupy one corner of the Nunavut territory for hunting, fishing, trapping and other traditional pursuits that are so much a part of their lives.

In fact the Dene are often described in other aboriginal languages as the caribou eaters. Their historical way of life has been to follow the caribou herds back and forth across boundaries that certainly do not exist for caribou and never did exist for Dene people either.

I must say that I am pleased that this agreement came about. It looked, as the minister said a few days ago, as though the overlapping claims, particularly with the Dene people in Saskatchewan, might well stand in the way of this historic event. This is something that we all would have profoundly regretted. We worked very hard to avoid this.

The reason that happens I am sad to say is that the role of the Government of Canada, although positive in the sense that it wanted to achieve an agreement and committed time and resources to it, has had an element to it that I describe as moving from negligence to intransigence to virtually blackmail.

Certainly no individual can be held accountable for that litany. However if you look at the record there are elements of that in the way the Government of Canada has approached this whole situation.

When I first got elected in 1988 this was an issue that was just coming to prominence among the Dene people. In February 1989 I attended a meeting with people who had been working on these negotiations for at least a dozen years on behalf of the federal government. I found to my amazement that these people who represented the Government of Canada were not aware that Dene people cross 60th parallel to hunt, fish and trap let alone have some treaty interests in that area.

This is unacceptable because the Government of Canada is supposed to be the trustee for certainly aboriginal people but the rights and interests of treaty people are supposed to be protected by the government. Their trustee in 1989 at that late stage was not even aware they had any interest whatsoever in that territory. That is negligence.

• (1435)

Then it became very inconvenient to deal with this new factor which had come into the negotiations. Therefore when it came to dealing with the fundamental question of treaty rights, the attitude of the Government of Canada can only be described as intransigent.

Certainly, it made resources available to document use and occupancy through negotiating section 40 of the agreement. It did everything else virtually except that implied treaty and aboriginal rights. It could never bring itself to fundamentally address the question of treaty and aboriginal rights.

Then regrettably in the closing moments of this whole process, after the agreement had been signed, members of Parliament are aware of the kinds of threats that circulated around this House of what would happen if there was any delay in this legislation. That is really unfortunate. However, wiser heads prevail.

The hon. member for Nunatsiaq and I always had the feeling that if the Inuit and the Dene people were able to meet face to face to resolve these issues, the resolution would not only be possible but it would also be an important part of this whole process.

Indeed on Tuesday that came to pass. An agreement was signed between the Denesuline of northern Saskatchewan and the Inuit. I have that in my hands and I would like to table it when my speech is done.

Part I of this letter says that the Inuit of Nunavut recognize that Saskatchewan's Denesuline have traditionally used and continue to use certain lands north of the 60th parallel based on their treaty and aboriginal rights.

That was a very important milestone, not just because of the substance of the agreement. Even more important, it demonstrated that two aboriginal groups could themselves arrive at agreements that the Government of Canada in some ways was virtually irrelevant in.

I would like very much to compliment everybody who was involved in negotiating this overlap agreement. It recognizes that Nunavut is much stronger as an entity if it has allies rather than adversaries on its borders. It points to a new partnership in that part of the world which will be of benefit, not just to the people involved, but to all Canadians.

It might also be recognized that an agreement was signed between the Dene of Manitoba and the Inuit some time prior to that. That agreement forms an important part of the movement forward in the creation of Nunavut as well.

I add the caveat that there are court cases outstanding to establish Canada's recognition of the treaty and aboriginal rights.

With the creation of Nunavut, the tide of Canadian history is turning. For far too long, since the time of contact, there has been a sense that what needed to happen was for aboriginal peoples to learn from Europeans, to adopt their technology, ways, governments, languages and cultures. It has been a one-way street, at least as far as the records are concerned. Certainly for the explorers, the fur traders and many others, there has been two-way communication but overwhelmingly it has been a one-way street.

With this agreement the tide starts to turn. We start to learn from aboriginal people. We start to learn about consensus decision making that transcends the petty partisanship which often characterizes our politics. It talks about respect for the elders and their history. We also get to learn a profound sense of the sacredness of mother earth and our responsibilities as her creatures.

I would like to conclude my remarks by saying what a pleasure it has been to be involved in this very important occasion in Canadian political life.

• (1440)

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Paproski in the chair.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. House in committee on Bill C-132, an act to establish a territory to be known as Nunavut and provide for its government and to amend certain acts in consequence thereof.

Shall clause 2 carry?

Clause 2 agreed to.

Clauses 3 to 79 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Schedules I to III inclusive agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall the title carry?

Mr. Ray Funk (Prince Albert—Churchill River): Mr. Chairman, I do not have a great deal of questioning but there are two questions I would like to pose to the minister that deal with the bill as a whole. Therefore I think this is the appropriate time to deal with them.

My questions are with respect to the claims that have been made by the constituents I represent, the Denesuline people in northern Saskatchewan and by extension in Manitoba.

The Dene people present the argument that they have an unextinguished treaty and aboriginal right in one corner of the Nunavut territory. The elders have put forward this argument very forcefully. Those of us who believe one should listen to the wisdom of the elders cannot help but be impressed by the sincerity in their belief of their treaty rights, that their signing of the treaty in 1899 did not extinguish in the way the federal government claims it did, their rights over their traditional territories.

I remind the House that in the Charlottetown agreement there was a recognition by all the governments in Canada, including the aboriginal people, that the wisdom of the elders was to hold equal sway with what was written in English with respect to the modern meaning of treaty.

I am not a lawyer and I have not read all of the documentation with respect to these kinds of questions. To me however, there has always been a fundamental illogic in the government's position.

The government has said to my constituents, the Dene that live south of the 60th parallel, that their treaty and aboriginal rights were extinguished by the signing of treaty eight. At the same time the government has given *de facto* recognition in the way it is proceeding with comprehensive claims negotiation to five bands north of the 60th parallel, the Snowdrift, Fort Resolution, Hay River and Dene bands. They have remaining treaty and aboriginal rights in the territories, at least to the extent that a comprehensive claims process is proceeding on their behalf with their involvement.

I cannot understand how it is possible that the same extinguishment clause in treaty eight, which was signed in 1899 before the current Northwest Territories boundary existed, could have extinguished the treaty and aboriginal rights of the treaty eight bands south of the 60th parallel while at the same time it did not by the *de facto* recognition of the government extinguish similar claims to those bands north of the 60th parallel.

• (1445)

Hon. Thomas Siddon (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): The hon. member raises a question about the territorial delineation of the treaty's benefiting the Dene people of northern Manitoba and Saskatchewan, but particularly those within his constituency. They are the Denesuline.

Treaty five applies to the Dene and Chipewyan people of northern Manitoba. It clearly specifies that land rights did not extend north of the 60th parallel. The treaties in northern Saskatchewan extending up to what is presently the western Arctic, treaty eight in particular, does not have such a boundary limitation in it.

It has been our view that where a territorial area was established for any of the numbered treaties and where the beneficiaries of those treaties accepted the treaty land quantums that those established the territorial ownership under aboriginal title of those particular signatories to the treaty.

That in itself in no way extinguished other aboriginal rights which might persist. It has always been our position that treaty rights which may later be defined or on which the treaties may not be clear and treaty or aboriginal rights which at some future date might be proven to exist are not foreclosed by the numbered treaties which were signed in the late 19th century and early 20th century.

The question of whether treaty land rights persist north of the 60th parallel has been raised before the Federal Court in both a Saskatchewan case last autumn and another case on appeal this year. The Federal Court has found that those treaty rights to land do not persist north of the 60th parallel.

The TFN final agreement specifies that it does not affect in any way aboriginal or treaty rights that may persist, that these bands might have. In addition the agreement has provisions that protect hunting activities, cabin sites, archaeological sites, and other traditional uses that can be demonstrated by proper historical research by any of these parties.

It is for this reason that negotiations first commenced between the Tungavik Federation of Nunavut and the Dene of the northern parts of the provinces. That goes back to 1985. In fact the hon. member may know that an agreement was reached in 1986 by the negotiators for both parties.

Therefore, it is not correct to suggest that this was left to the last minute or that the government has been unaware or inflexible on this issue. We have attempted to bring the parties together to come to an agreement on how this question might be resolved in the future.

Apparently the parties did not ratify the agreement reached in 1986 but there have been ongoing discussions. The member says he became aware of the problem in 1988. In 1990 when we signed the agreement in principle, I was not approached or made aware of any residual difficulty.

It has always been my view however where the beneficiary of a comprehensive land claim has an unresolved dispute with a neighbouring first nation or people, it is desirable but not essential that those disputes be resolved before the land claim is settled to the benefit of the beneficiary party.

I am delighted that as recently as this week an understanding has been reached by way of the letter the hon. member says he has tabled. As well the department of Indian affairs is providing $75,000 in financial support to the Dene of northern Saskatchewan to further their case before the courts. I wish them well. I am confident, as some of us have observed, the conclusion of the TFN land claim agreement and the Nunavut accord will give them a stronger case from which to maximize their rights and interests in the TFN settlement area.

• (1450)

Mr. Funk: Mr. Chairman, I thank the minister for his remarks. I had hoped he might come to the same position as the TFN did a few days ago, but perhaps that was unrealistic.

I would also like to make one small correction to his remarks. The court finding, at least in the case of the Saskatchewan Dene, did not rule on questions of substance but rather of process. The court case had to do with an application for injunction to stop the plebiscite from moving forward. The court found that holding the plebiscite did not in itself jeopardize the position of the Dene. At the same time the court said there were questions of substance that needed to be addressed.

The agreement of 1985–86 to which the minister referred was between the Manitoba Dene people and not the Saskatchewan Dene people. I just want that to be correct on the record.

I would also like to table with the House the recent and current land use study which supports the contention that land use and occupancy do occur in the Nunavut territory on a current and ongoing basis.

I have a final question for the minister. As he is aware several weeks ago in Fond du Lac there were hearings of the Indian claims commission chaired by Harry Laforme respecting the the treaty right question. That commission has not said precisely when it might be ruling. Obviously it was not in time for this process; perhaps it will be by the end of the summer.

Will the minister commit the government to accepting the recommendations of that commission? What attitude will the Government of Canada have toward that commission? Being a new commission, there are no precedents on how the Government of Canada will treat recommendations from that particular commission?

The Deputy Chairman: Before I recognize the minister, does the hon. member have consent to table the document?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Deputy Chairman: Agreed and so ordered.

Mr. Siddon: Mr. Chairman, in so far as the Indian Specific Claims Commission is concerned, the hon. member knows the commission was set up under the powers of the Inquiries Act to provide advice to government as commissions of inquiries do on the extent to which particular claims the government has rejected might be readdressed by the government because, it may be argued, there is a lawful obligation on the part of Canada.

The specific claims commission has criteria by which it is to conduct itself in regard of claims or alleged claims which result from a lawful obligation. Therefore it is important the specific claims commission address itself to issues. While we have rejected them on the basis of legal advice from the Department of Justice that we do not have a lawful obligation, those claims must stem in some way from a document or a legal commitment of some sort which is arguably binding upon the government.

In the case of any of the claims Mr. Laforme's commission is addressing, if we receive that advice we expect it to be backed up with thorough research and legal arguments. Then we will make a decision which remains to be the minister's prerogative with respect to any such claims.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported, concurred in, read the third time and passed.

• (1455)

Mr. Siddon: Mr. Speaker, there has been agreement that there would not be closing speeches. I just wanted to thank all members of the House for their co-operation this afternoon.

I would like to say to the people of the western Arctic whose interests have not really been addressed today that we are very conscious of their feelings regarding the future.

We are all very grateful to the negotiators who served so well for the two governments of the Northwest Territories and Canada, and especially the representatives of the Tungavik Federation of Nunavut who are here today.

In conclusion I would like to say the following to our guests today.

[*Editor's Note: Minister spoke in Inuktitut.*]

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I am sure all members of the House will concur in whatever the hon. minister said.

Mr. Anawak: Mr. Speaker, I can safely say there were no derogatory remarks.

I would like to close by saying as I mentioned earlier that this has been a very humbling experience. It is a very proud day for the people of Nunavut as represented by the people in the gallery from Nunavut area.

I am very proud to have been part of the deliberations on the two bills: on the land claims bill and on the bill dealing with the creation of Nunavut.

Along with my colleagues from the north we are able to say that June 4, 1993 is a very important day for the people of Nunavut. It is a day to remember and tell our grandchildren about.

Mr. Skelly (Comox—Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks made by the minister once I get a translation. I trust the member for Nunatsiaq who assured us there was nothing derogatory in them.

I agree with his statement that June 4, 1993 is an important day for the people of Nunavut. It is almost equivalent to the July 1 celebration Canada enjoys on its birthday.

I am very proud to have been here representing the New Democratic Party at the birthday of Nunavut. I wish the young territory all the best in the future. Given the talent brought to bear on the negotiations, that talent will be brought to bear on the government of Nunavut and we will have a very successful territory.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I want hon. members to know those last three little speeches were congratulatory speeches, not speeches on third reading.

It being 3 p.m. the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

AGRICULTURE

FAMILY FARM

Mr. Vic Althouse (Mackenzie) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of protecting the family farm through stable returns to producers and funding for assembly and long-term lease-purchase of farmland.

He said: Mr. Speaker, for a few moments this afternoon I take my privilege and right as a private member to introduce some ideas I hope the government will attend. It seems to me it has been pursuing policies on agriculture and trade that are not serving the best interests of local and rural communities. I was hoping this afternoon to put a few ideas before the government that would make it change its policy so they would be more helpful to rural people.

In all debates on agriculture, trade and economic policies these days from the government benches I will begin by saying that we have to face that we are a global community and we must be competitive in that global community. We must have sustainable production and things will taper off after that.

We should make it quite clear there has never been anything but a recognition by Canadians of all persuasions, whether they are Progressive Conservatives, New Democrats, Liberal or political non-believers, that we are living in a global economy. I am from western Canada. Most of its economy is dominated by people who originated in Europe. They came to that part of the world because they thought there were some opportunities. The products they produced had to go to other parts of the world to find markets. We have always been a global economy in terms of the thinking on the farms of western Canada.

We have contacts in all parts of the globe. We sell to all parts of the globe. There has never been any doubt that we were a global economy. It leaves me somewhat sad and baffled to see the front benches of the Conservative government trying to pretend that they are inventing globalization. They have not.

What they have invented is a different kind of globalization. It is becoming evident in the economic models. When one looks at the practice of the three or four larger trading blocs of the world one sees that there are emerging three global models.

One model is the American-British model, the sort of Reagan-Thatcher view of life, that looks at the world working in an economic system wherein there are very few rules other than the devil take the hindmost and the one with the most bucks wins. This kind of economic model means the lowest price and the cheapest wage will always get the jobs. That is a model that has no great future.

Granted, it is the one the government is attempting to tie itself to, a deregulated kind of economy with no rules and nothing limiting the power of the transnational and international corporations. It has not worried about what happens to the people who have to stay in the country and cannot move as readily and as easily as transnational corporations. We can forget about that model. We have to worry about it now because the government that adopted it as its code of practice is now in power. Hopefully it will not last very much longer.

Another economic model that has been pursued globally with some success is the Japanese model wherein business and government form a very cosy alliance and various corporations do joint ventures. The Japanese for Japanese business take on the world and usually win. That model is beginning to show some signs of having difficulties. Mostly the problem is that we have great difficulty from a societal sense accepting the close regimentation workers have to follow and the loyalty to their company for a lifetime.

• (1505)

It goes both ways. The company is also loyal to its workers. That has not been part of our practice in this country and so we probably would find that somewhat difficult to adapt to.

Most futurists see the third model, the European model that has developed, as the kind of model that is most likely to survive because it is a more communal kind of model involving labour, workers, rural people, governments and corporations all working together for a set of combined common goals that are good for all of the participants in the effort to expand their influence in the world community.

The Europeans have come together economically and to some extent politically. They have taken all of the players in the economy and come up with a fairly workable mix of labour, business and government decision making that most closely copies the kind of thinking that exists in New Democratic philosophy and political policies.

I think that model is the one that we have to look at as the one that is most likely to survive. I believe the reason that it will survive is that unlike the first model that I mentioned, the British–American system in which the objective is to get to the cheapest labour and the cheapest raw resources, the European model looks at ways of improving standards of living, wages and prices in a way that will improve all of the society together. Instead of depressing society it attempts to improve it.

That is the model that we would do well to copy. The proposals I am putting on the table today for agriculture tend to copy some of those ideas but they are essentially Canadian solutions made for Canadians in Canada.

Members will notice that the motion asks the government to do two things. I will deal with the first one first. It says:

> The government should consider the advisability of protecting the family farm through stable returns to producers—

In the past we have not had systems of stable returns that will withstand the onslaught of international trading rules. To be fair neither have the Europeans, Japanese, or Americans. Everybody is searching for this kind of solution. We are saying, after lengthy discussions and consultations with various farm organizations over the last five or six years, that perhaps the place to start is to look at the amount of the domestic market that is supplied by Canadian farmers and divide that among them and provide some price guarantees and assistance through tax dollars so that we are not put at a disadvantage to those countries we compete against. In particular we should not be at a disadvantage to our American cousins and neighbours.

We have said, and I will use the grain sector as an example, that we will take the amount of grain that is utilized within Canada and is fed and consumed here and divide it among all the farmers. That will amount to between 8,000 and 9,000 bushels per existing farm.

For a beginning, why does the government not simply offer to meet the price guarantees that the Americans are giving their farmers on that domestically consumed grain so there would be no exportation of subsidies. The way we are proposing to do it would not impact upon secondary users whether hog feeders, beef feeders, or dairymen.

• (1510)

It would simply be a guarantee equivalent to the guarantees that the United States gives to its producers. At the current American target prices and at the current exchange rate between Canadian and American currency that would amount to about $5 per bushel on delivery at the elevator. It would be approximately $2.75 a bushel on delivery for corn, $6.25 a bushel for canola, $2.95 a bushel for barley and $1.80 a bushel for oats.

The farmer would receive the guaranteed price on his initial deliveries at the elevator until he had made approximately $40,000 in sales. The subsidy that would be available on the product that he was presenting for sale would be paid by the taxpayers of Canada.

The cost of this kind of system would be no more and perhaps even less than has been the case with the *ad hoc* programs that have been proposed and the programs that have been put in place through GRIP, which are paid for by federal and provincial taxpayers as well as by farmers.

Therefore the subsidy levels would not be much different but the effect of the subsidy would be felt very directly in the rural communities. Instead of spreading those taxpayer dollars across all the production we would instead be dividing it among the producers.

The smaller and middle sized producers would reap a proportionately larger benefit from this kind of system than would the very large producers. Very large producers at the moment receive tens of thousands and even hundreds of thousands of dollars through the various subsidy programs that are available.

I do not think it makes much sense for large growing entities to be receiving taxpayer dollars to continue to grow and prosper when they could do that all very well on their own as good, efficient and effective producers.

The emphasis has to change. In addition to the changes in the way that government assistance from the over-all community through the country is dispersed to the farming communities there has to be further consideration than has been shown at this point to the future of those rural communities.

In a deregulated market, which the government is hell bent upon moving us toward, there is very little opportunity for young and beginning farmers to become farmers. The young people are virtually elbowed out of the farm community at the moment.

I know this is a problem under deregulation for all young people. It is extremely difficult if not impossible for anyone under 25 to find a position at all. That is a result, to a large extent, of the deregulation and the mean-spirited approach that we have been insisting and persisting in following lately.

It is even more difficult to establish a young family on a farm because of the investment requirements, even though land values have dropped considerably and there is not a lot of hurry to go out there and bid up the price of farmland. It is very difficult for young people to find the kind of credit and raise the kind of funds they need in order to establish their own family on a farm.

There is a lot of farmland sitting available. It is not all sitting idle. A lot of it is being farmed by lease. However institutions like the federal banks, the big five, hold a great deal of farm property. The Farm Credit Corporation, the Crown corporation which was struck to lend money to farmers, holds over a million acres of Canadian farmland right now. More than 85 per cent of that is in my home province of Saskatchewan.

• (1515)

It is loathe to sell those lands because it will not recover the amount of money that is owed against them. The value of the lands has dropped about 50 per cent since those loans were made in the last eight or ten years. As a consequence nobody wants to pay Farm Credit Corporation's debt for it. The only way that FCC will be able to move that land into the private sector is to take a loss on it, something it is of course not anxious to do, although the government does pick up a considerable amount of its losses every year.

The proposal that I think the government should be looking at is to take these lands that the Farm Credit Corporation has available, lands that the banks, some of the credit unions and some of the trust companies might have available, and form a local community trust or a community trust in each of the provinces, because land holding under our Constitution is under the aegis of the provinces.

It should allow them to continue to be shareholders in the land if they insist but should set up an agency whose mandate it is to lease land to beginning or younger farmers, not to the older, established ones but those under 30 or 35. It should make the leases relatively long term, 20 or 30 year leases, once the lessees show that they have the ability to do a competent job of farming the land. It should put local boards and directors in charge of the leasing, the administration and the overview of the lands to make sure that they are well handled so that younger people do have an opportunity to get a land base and to remain in those rural communities.

Without a regeneration of those rural communities there will be no children to go to school for the teaching jobs, there will be no children to be born in the communities so that there are hospitals, nurses and doctors, and there will be nobody to look after the elderly population that is filling up the nursing homes that are there now. The communities will continue to wither and die.

To a degree that has been happening now, but there have been magnificent efforts by those rural communities to sustain themselves and find production facilities they can invest in.

I continue to be amazed at the amount of money and effort that rural communities are willing to put into a new processing plant, regardless of how difficult it might be for that new product to come on to the market. The local communities put up their money, expertise, time and effort to make certain that some of these groups do have a chance to get started.

They do not do it because they think they will make a profit. Most of these people are buying shares in these community processing plants with the view that this is virtually a donation. They are doing it because they think that if they can get this plant going it will employ 15, 20 or 30 people and that will mean 15, 20 or 30 young

couples who can stay in that community, fill up the houses and keep the community going.

It is vital to the future of not only rural communities but the viable operation of Canada as we have known it. These modest changes to the way we view globalization and economic development could go a long way toward humanizing the kind of economic development and social structures that we have in our country.

I would hope that the government would begin to see the futility of following the Reagan–Thatcher model of globalization and look a little more closely at some of the things that the Japanese and the Europeans are doing because those countries have accepted a lot of socialist ideas that are good for people, are good for the economy and can even be good for global business.

• (1520)

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have a chance to say a few words on the motion of the hon. member for Mackenzie.

The motion before the House sets out the need for constructive and worth–while government programs. It is very beneficial that it should happen to be before the House today because the Minister of Agriculture, during the last 24 hours, has practically adopted a scorched earth policy toward Canadian farm organizations, groups like the Prairie Pools Incorporated and the Ontario Corn Producers. Many of the policies adopted are just unbelievable.

It was announced this morning by the Minister of Agriculture that he planned to open the border with the United States even though support programs have not been balanced as is required under the free trade deal. He is moving the marketing of barley from the Canadian Wheat Board to individual shipments. This means that we end up with a flooding of the market in Montana. It will drive down the price–setting mechanisms in the United States for barley that are set in Seattle and we will see lower prices and less returns. We will see an industry that is not going to be doing very well.

On the other hand, it is the government's wish to remove that barrier which was put in place by the FTA. It is the government's decision to take the exclusive responsibility for the marketing of barley in North America away from the Canadian Wheat Board.

We proposed in the agriculture committee that if the government is hell–bent on doing this, then it should put it to a plebiscite and let the producers decide. The Canadian Wheat Board is not an agency of the Government of Canada, it is an agency of the Canadian barley and wheat producers. Therefore, it is the barley and wheat producers who must decide if they want to have this exclusive responsibility, even though the Canadian Wheat Board has served the industry very well.

The studies that were done by Prairie Pools Incorporated suggest there is going to be a major cost to Canadian producers.

We started discussions in the agriculture committee and within a week government members on the committee shut down the whole review process. It is unbelievable the government is taking the marketing of barley away from the Canadian Wheat Board and then imposing its majority in the committee and not even allowing the Canadian Wheat Board to appear. I guess this is because the chairman of the Canadian Wheat Board had been so critical of the proposal to take away barley marketing.

The government will argue that the marketing of barley is only a few percentage points of the total wheat board operations, but in fact barley is a major coarse grain commodity. It is not just the volume, but the fact that the marketing of barley is removed from the wheat board weakens the wheat board and will have a long–term, disadvantageous effect on that board.

The second area in the trilogy of the scorched earth policy which has been adopted by the minister is to take away the interest–free cash advance.

The House will recall that the government moved in this direction two or three years ago and within six months of removing the interest–free feature of the cash advance program it had reinstated it. The economic situation was so desperate in the fall of 1990 that it suddenly reinstated the interest–free feature even though it had to do it by Order in Council. It had removed it as a statute program. We received an endless number of letters from the Ontario Corn Producers, the prairie pools, the corn producers in Manitoba, all making

the same argument, that this is one of the best programs the government has.

• (1525)

If everybody markets their corn or barley or wheat, or whatever the commodity is, at harvest time in October, prices are driven down. Everybody is desperately strapped for cash so this has the impact of driving the price of the commodity down. Under the interest-free cash advance, the mechanism is spun out so that the individual producer markets the crop in December or January or later on in the season and has a tremendous advantage. The advantage is not one for one, that you get an advantage of whatever the interest-free portion of the cash advance is, in some cases it is as high as 15 to 1.

I cannot for the life of me see why the government is removing that interest-free portion because the interest rates are at the lowest rate they have been in 10 or 15 years and it is the least costly of programs. When the government was driving the interest rates through the ceiling in 1989 and 1990, and interest rates for so many commodities were 14 and 15 per cent, at least double what they were in the United States, in a free trade environment one can imagine the impact it has had on the entire Canadian economy, but especially on Canadian farmers. Now when the interest rates are very low we have the ridiculous situation where the government is putting that additional burden on Canadian farmers.

That is the second part of the trilogy of the scorched earth policy that has been adopted by the government this spring. Beyond that, the government has moved today to table a bill in the House to change the method of payment of the Crow benefit.

This is the third part of the trilogy. Last December the government moved to chop the western grain transportation assistance program by some $72 million, roughly 10 per cent of the benefit itself. When the Minister of Finance brought down his budget a few months ago he said: "Okay, I have taken away $72 million. If you people do not adopt my policy I am going to double that". Well, it is a hollow threat because he is not going to be around. The idea of blackmailing producers with an either accept our policy or we will remove more of it is horrible.

This is a great historical support program. It was adopted because it is part of the Crow rate agreement dating back almost a hundred years. If the farmers do not agree to the change in the method of the Crow benefit, the government will reduce the benefit. It is breaking faith with thousands of producers.

I hope the government will back down on this. There may have to be changes if the GATT agreement determines that this is an export subsidy and subject to a mandatory reduction. But at this stage there is no consensus and the government should not be cutting that support. It should not be blackmailing Canadian farmers at this time, or any other time, by threatening to reduce their support programs if they do not agree to the changes that the government is threatening.

I am glad to have had this opportunity to make these few comments this afternoon on the hon. member's motion because clearly this is a black day for Canadian farmers in what the government is proposing in these three scorched earth policies.

• (1530)

Mr. Bob Porter (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the hon. member for Mackenzie for his concern about the future of the family farm. He and I have shared a considerable amount of time on the standing committee as has the previous speaker. While we do have those concerns, we may have different views on how to achieve them.

The government understands the important role of the family farm operation in our rural communities, economically and socially. That is why we have stood by Canadian farmers in times of need. Certainly these last few years have been times when farmers in all areas have gone through difficult periods as a result of markets, of weather conditions and of a variety of problems that they have faced.

In 1986-87 we provided $2 billion to help farmers cope with low grain prices caused by an international subsidy war. In 1988, when farmers were dealing with one of the worst droughts in the history of this country there was $800 million in special support through the Canadian Crop Drought Assistance Program.

As well, one may recall the program that was brought in for the deferral on breeder stock which had taken place that year where livestock had to be culled. If the tax had been paid and those cattle been replaced at the higher market value, that would have had a detrimental effect. This government did recognize, after 20 years of previous agricultural groups trying to initiate that program, the fact that breeding stock is like the machinery

we use in any manufacturing plant to turn grass into beef and not tax it in times of disadvantage.

There was a further $500 million through the Special Income Assistance Program in 1990. It was followed by the Farm Support and Adjustment Measures, one and two, which provided $1.4 billion in federal support.

Between 1985 and 1992 almost $17 billion in direct federal payments have gone to producers. The government has been there for Canadian farmers. However I share the hon. member's view that the long-term viability of the family farm cannot and will not be brought back with programs that put a cheque in the mail. Farmers do not want it that way. They would rather in all cases—those I talk to—get their returns from the marketplace.

The success or failure of the family farm will depend on its ability to compete. As the hon. member has said, we have always had to compete in world markets. It has been emphasized before. There are some commodities which are more regionalized. Some are on a North American market and obviously in our grain sector on world markets.

To ensure fair and stable returns the industry needs long-term solutions and certainly better prices, improved market opportunities, diversification and world development opportunities. Those needs are driving our reform of agricultural policies and programs. This reform is being carried out with the participation of provinces and the industry.

The key to that reform is securing access to markets. The Canadian agrifood sector depends on trade. One of our priorities is to get a reduction in the subsidies used by Canada's major competitors in international grain markets. We can do all of these wonderful things that have been suggested, but if there is $320 billion in agricultural subsidies throughout the world, supply and demand has little impact on what will happen to individual markets.

Obviously if we could resolve some of the problems that we are trying to do under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, and end the trade war that still plagues our grain sector, it would not end all of our problems. It would perhaps bring some stability to world markets.

I noted with some interest the hon. member talking about other ways of doing things. I commend anybody who has suggestions for improving the situation in agriculture.

Land banking is something that has been tried. I think, Sir, that it has been tried in your province before. I can recall it a number of years ago in the 1950s and the 1960s. I do not know whether there were positive results.

Rural communities are going through changes in most areas. Some of it is going to happen regardless of the policies of government or with markets. There is a change in the lifestyle of some of the people who live there. Schools systems are changing. The road system has changed. Most people from small, rural communities are retiring into the larger centres.

• (1535)

We have seen that happening. I come from a community where the largest growth industry involves retired Saskatchewan farmers moving into Medicine Hat. They move there for a number of reasons. They want availability of health care, a recreation facility and better housing. They are not going to stay, as they did a number of years ago in the small, local community when they retire from the family farm. I do not think any of the programs that we are talking about are going to have an impact there. It is a change that is taking place throughout this country and others and I think it is a reality that perhaps we have to face.

We know the benefits of secure market access through our trade agreement with the United States. Our share of American markets is now larger than it has ever been. I am looking at headlines from about two weeks ago in *The Calgary Herald*. It indicates that the annual revenue from cattle and calves has grown by 64 per cent or $700 million since 1984 to achieve a forecast of $1.8 billion this year. This is in the province of Alberta. The trend is accelerating, fed by growth in exports to the United States. Canadian cattle achieved a five-fold growth in their share of U.S. beef markets to 5 per cent since 1987. We are now slaughtering roughly 60 per cent of all the cattle in Canada in the province of Alberta. Even with that taking place I noted last week that 11,000 head of slaughter cattle were going across the border.

We have access to another market is one of the things which has added some stability to our market. It is also closer than providing a shipment to the Montreal market as we have done in the past. Some of the trade is moving on a north-south basis rather than being forced east or west as it was for the last 100 years has served the industry well on both sides of the border. We can perhaps see that happening in other commodities.

We hope to see access extended through the North American free trade agreement to include Mexico, which is a market that is growing quickly. Earlier this year a thousand Canadian firms attended a trade show in Mexico. These were not large conglomerates and huge corporations. They were small firms from 10 to 100 employees. There was interest shown there. Some contracts were signed that could develop through this initiative. Further, other countries of the southern hemisphere have shown an interest in trading with Canada.

We do have things like malt barley going into Colombia. We have trade in energy resources. We have firms in western Canada at the present time that were developing markets in some of those countries there. There is an interest on behalf of other countries in opening up trade.

Last November we announced a trade opportunity strategy that helped the agrifood sector improve its marketing success abroad. The strategy will see Canada establish positions in our embassies in key growth markets. These people in these positions will promote our agrifood products and help link up sellers in this country with buyers.

As part of that strategy we have established an agrifood export council chaired by Ted Bilyea, vice president and general manager of international trade for Maple Leaf Foods Inc. Canada. This council will help develop policies that will help us improve our agrifood export performance. At the same time we are working with industry to help the sector become more competitive even in the face of international pressures over which they have no control.

We recently passed amendments to the Farm Credit Corporation Act which gave the FCC more flexibility to help farmers who want to diversify their operations with off-farm—but related—opportunities. A number of farmers have expressed over the years an interest in being able to finance some of the farm-related businesses that they have developed. We have seen that taking place across western Canada.

We passed Bill C-54 which is the national check-off legislation that is allowing innovators like the Canadian Cattlemen's Association the flexibility to respond to market and research opportunities as they see fit. Last year the federal government launched a review of the regulations within Agriculture Canada. This involved the Grains and Oilseed Branch, including the Canadian Wheat Board, the Canadian Grain Commission and the Food Production and Inspection Branch. Industry representatives have played a central role in this process. I think the objective of this review is to reduce unnecessary policies and regulations which impede competitiveness without compromising in any way the safety of Canada's food supply.

• (1540)

Probably another area that we should look at is the interprovincial trade barriers, not just with agriculture but within a lot of other areas. There are 500 impediments to trade between provinces across this nation. Obviously agriculture gets caught up in some of the problems that we face in trying to deal within our own country.

We have made progress in a number of areas. For example we are holding discussions with the provinces on setting up pilot projects to eliminate duplicate inspections between the two levels of government.

We have tabled changes in the Canada Grains Act this spring including plans to eliminate maximum tariffs at grain elevators.

I guess we are simply posing the question: Are there other ways of doing things that in the end help the farmers' bottom line. I think it is only right, I think it is only fair that regardless of where we come from or which side of the House we are on that we must look at any way that we can which has some viability for improving the situation of those people who make their living producing an agricultural product.

We are posing the question regarding western grain transportation. It is an issue that has been sensitive. It has been coming up for generations. Most of us have heard both sides of that issue. I have listened to that ever since I was very young. We have not resolved it yet. I think it is going to have to be focused on regardless of what happens in the international marketplace. It is

coming to a focus and I think we should be seriously considering what we do with that.

Our goal is to—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I do regret the hon. member's time has expired.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, I hate the fact that another member had to be interrupted for me to speak. I always listen carefully to the comments of the hon. member across. I know he has a very strong attachment to the agricultural community. I am always pleased to hear what he has to say, as I was to listen to the comments of the hon. member for Algoma and of our colleague from Saskatchewan as well.

We are debating today the motion to consider the advisability of protecting the family farm through stable returns and, second, for the funding for land assembly and long-term lease-purchase of land.

The funding for land assembly is not always a popular issue depending on how that is put. I am sure my colleague from Saskatchewan will agree that it has not always been a popular idea. Certainly the lease-purchase kind of initiative I think would meet the approval of many Canadians.

When the hon. member spoke a little earlier about some one million acres that the Farm Credit Corporation owns right now, shall we call it a reluctant owner of one million acres or so, I was not surprised at that figure because I had heard it many times. As the hon. member will know I have a large agricultural constituency as well. What I did not know was that 85 per cent of that land was in his own province of Saskatchewan.

There is a very sad message in that. That message I believe is the following, that for those areas of the country which depend on cash crops the cash cropping business has been so bad over recent years that many farmers have unfortunately gone out of business and have lost their farms.

We all knew that, but in other parts of the country where supply managed agriculture is a more popular form of agriculture, for a whole variety of reasons fewer farms have ended up being foreclosed or otherwise getting into the Farm Credit Corporation's hands.

If that happens with the Farm Credit Corporation I am sure it is also true of other banking institutions as well. Banks have become owners of large tracts of land and of course they are reluctant owners. I am sure they would rather be doing the business of banking rather than owning farm land and they are reluctant owners there.

• (1545)

Where there are no instruments to ensure stability in the farming area, the absence of those instruments has made it such that there is a higher rate of failure in those particular sectors. That brings me to the following topic.

I want to speak briefly about supply managed agriculture in Canada. The hon. member across, a colleague from Alberta, will know of my strong attachment to supply managed agriculture. He and I participated in a series of international meetings only a few weeks ago at which we had some occasion to raise these issues with leaders of other nations. He will know that I have a strong attachment for that particular method of ensuring the stability of the agricultural sector.

I want to talk a little bit about an area that perhaps I am a little bit more familiar with than I am with other areas, the area of dairy farming. There are a large number of dairy farmers in the riding of Glengarry—Prescott—Russell.

There are some 33,000 dairy farms in Canada. They provide approximately 100,000 jobs in this country. Operating a dairy farm is no bed of roses. It is a very difficult industry but it is at least more stable than other areas of farming where there is no supply management or other tools to ensure stability of income.

What is interesting is that the Canadian dairy industry receives approximately $266 million from subsidies right now. If anyone thinks that is a large amount of money, as a percentage of income it is actually very small. Something like 7 per cent of what dairy farmers get is from subsidies.

In the United States where there is no such initiative as supply management as we know it for dairy farmers, $66 billion is spent annually on agricultural subsidies and 34 per cent of the revenue of a U.S. dairy farmer comes from governments. If anyone likes to say "why do quotas exist, why can they not just compete freely and it would be a lot cheaper", it depends on whose mathematics.

No one can tell me that $66 billion of U.S. agricultural subsidies indicate there is something efficient about that particular form of marketing or doing business there. Indeed I would argue that the reverse is true. With our system only 7 per cent of income to dairy farmers comes from governments. That is indeed far more efficient.

We all know that the price of milk in both countries is substantially the same. I know someone will phone me up tomorrow and say: "Mr. Boudria, we saw this on television. We want you to know that last week milk in Massena was selling for one-third less than it sells for in Cornwall".

Of course they forget to say that was a loss leader designed to get people to cross the border to do a little bit of cross-border shopping and has nothing to do with the average price of milk sold in that area because it is substantially similar. I enumerated statistics some months ago comparing Detroit, Windsor, Cornwall and Massena and a number of other border communities in both Canada and the United States.

I think I argued at that point, and quite successfully if I may be so presumptuous as to suggest, that the prices were essentially the same in both countries notwithstanding the fact that the Canadian dairy producers get very little direct assistance from government as opposed to what they do south of the border.

The difference is that the stability that exists in the system here has been good for the Canadian dairy industry.

[*Translation*]

That is why I support Canadian farmers and especially the marketing boards that want to preserve supply management systems in Canada, including my own province, Ontario, for dairy farmers.

I must say today that I am very concerned. This may be my last chance to make a speech in the House before the election. Next week the House will probably adjourn and is not expected to come back. Those members who are re-elected by their constituents some time next fall will come back.

Finally, I want to take this opportunity to thank the people of Glengarry—Prescott—Russell for sending me to this, the highest court in the land, as their elected representative.

Mr. Speaker, as I said before, we are nearing the end of this session and the GATT negotiations are continuing. I must say that I am concerned about the future of supply management. A few weeks ago I had a chance to talk to the delegates and presidents of Venezuela and Colombia, both members of GATT. I must say that neither country supports our position on supply management. I know the government keeps saying it wants to preserve article XI of GATT, which allows us to have supply management, but I am not at all convinced that the other countries support us in this.

[*English*]

In the event that I do not have an opportunity to speak again in this Parliament, it is only a week from its adjournment, I know that you, Sir, may not be a candidate for office. I am going to take this opportunity to indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, my strong and sincere best wishes on whatever future plans you have.

I have particular affection for this particular Speaker. He was a member when I was on staff on Parliament Hill many years ago.

I do wish for you, Sir, that the future will bring many good things to you.

I also take this opportunity to say to my colleagues in this House in all parties how much I have enjoyed working with them. Of course it may not be a surprise to hear me say that I hope I am back to discuss issues again in this Chamber with many of the members who will be re-elected and new ones who will be coming in. It may not shock anyone to hear that I hope many of those new ones will be of my political affiliation.

Perhaps the day will come soon when I will have the opportunity to address the Speaker from the other side of the House. I hope that opportunity does come soon because I have been in opposition for many years.

With that I want to thank you, Mr. Speaker, and say to all my colleagues and our staff here in the Chamber how much I have enjoyed being a member for all these years. I do hope I am back again to continue my work on behalf of my constituents.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I thank my hon. colleagues. I know one thing. When I leave here I will have a few black suits and I can always get myself a hat and be a taxi driver or a chauffeur.

There being no further members rising for debate, the time provided for consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired.

Pursuant to Standing Order 96(1), the order is dropped from the Order Paper.

It being four o'clock p.m., this House stands adjourned until Monday next at 11 o'clock a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

The House adjourned at 3.54 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, June 7, 1993

The House met at 11 a.m.

Prayers

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

PHYSICIAN ASSISTED SUICIDE

Mr. Raymond Skelly (North Island—Powell River) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should urgently consider amending the Criminal Code to permit physician assisted suicide when:

(a) it is requested by the patient;

(b) the patient is terminally ill and will experience a painful death;

(c) two independent physicians certify that the patient's condition is terminal; and

(d) the office of the Attorney General for the province has reviewed the case.

• (1110)

He said: Mr. Speaker, the motion before us today is a variation on a number of motions that have been put forward in this House. The member for Fraser Valley West managed to put forward a motion, convince the House to support it on second reading and carry it through to a very useful committee study which dealt with the issue in great depth.

Today is the last opportunity for the House to consider this matter. The matter is also before the Supreme Court of Canada. It has been brought there by a very courageous woman, Sue Rodriguez, who suffers from the disease commonly known as Lou Gehrig's disease.

This disease is fatal. As she describes it in *The Globe and Mail* of May 21, 1993 the reason she has brought this forward is, in her words, because: "I simply do not want to die a gruesome death". It is with a great deal of personal courage and a commitment to others who will find themselves in the same circumstances that this matter has been brought to the Supreme Court of Canada.

I would also like to thank Nicki Segal, an intern who has done a great deal of work on the research and presentation of the material that we are going to be considering in the House today.

The issue that Sue Rodriguez raises in the Supreme Court of Canada, and which she has taken through every level in the court system, is essentially physician assisted suicide. She is asking that she be given the right to have her physician assist her in committing suicide rather than face the gruesome death this disease will inflict upon her.

Suicide is not illegal. There are those who have sought suicide in order to avoid a degrading and painful death. They have sought to have their physicians assist them with this action.

The other day I came across the case of a woman who had a friend who spent virtually every day in the hospital with her as the woman suffered from the same disease. The patient's physical condition had deteriorated to such a degree that only this friend could communicate with her. Every single day she asked to die. It is an important issue for this House.

Right now the Criminal Code prevents someone from assisting another in a suicide. Apparently the law goes back 101 years. It does not contemplate the realities of our society today where about 75 per cent of deaths are attributable to chronic degenerative diseases such as cancer, AIDS and a variety of other diseases. As we have been more and more successful in preventing certain kinds of diseases, these diseases are forming a major part of the health spectrum. They are characterized by a complete loss of control and quite often by a very serious and painful death.

In some cases, where an individual specifically requests it, people find themselves in a situation in which determining the time at which life ends can improve the quality of life. It can prevent death in great pain and degradation because of the complete loss of control

when the individual does not have the ability to control even the simplest of life's functions.

The proposal before us is that one more time we ask the government to bring forward an amendment to the Criminal Code. It would probably take section 241(b), which says that no one may assist another to commit suicide, and simply add a number of clauses to it. Those clauses would say that no one could assist someone to commit suicide unless it was a physician assisting a patient.

The physician could assist the patient in committing suicide if the patient were terminally ill, if the patient were mentally competent, if the patient repeatedly asked to be assisted in committing suicide by his or her physician, if the facts were certified by an independent physician, and if the case were reviewed by the office of the Attorney General, and that could be the local coroner, the Crown counsel or whomever.

• (1115)

If we ask this House, ask the government, to pass that motion, it could be put forward quickly. It could resolve the matter raised by Sue Rodriguez and others who ask to be assisted by a physician in committing suicide in order to avoid a degrading and painful death.

This is not an issue for the courts. At every stage the courts have asked Parliament to relieve them from a responsibility which is not truly theirs. In the initial instance through the Supreme Court of B.C. and even before the Supreme Court of Canada, the indication has been that this issue is not the responsibility of the courts.

They ask that Parliament fulfil a responsibility to these people to allow them to undertake an act which should not be illegal. We should not be bound by an antiquated law that does not recognize the changes in our society.

This is probably the last opportunity this Parliament will have to discuss this matter. It is not an issue for the courts. It is an issue for Parliament. It is unfortunate that the government has not put a bill before the House. It would have been extremely useful, on the heels of the motion put by the hon. member for Fraser Valley West, for the government to lay before the House a proposal for the consideration of Parliament and for the consideration of the people of Canada. It is now time that the government respond to this appeal. It appears that about 80 per cent of Canadians want something done.

I undertook a survey of the community of Powell River in my riding and the returns from that survey were many. About 75 per cent wanted something to resolve this matter. They are cautious about it. They want stringent controls but they do want to see us aid people who are suffering from a chronic terminal illness that is painful and degrading.

Many of them have seen their loved ones go through this process and they are asking that this Parliament do something. The courts are asking that we do something. Some of the people who are suffering from these illnesses are asking that they be given an opportunity to relieve this suffering.

It is my hope that the court will resolve the problem of Sue Rodriguez. In fact it is my hope that the Supreme Court of Canada will resolve the problem for all Canadians in this very narrow sphere and say that where it has been certified that the person is clearly terminally ill and where the person repeatedly asks, then after an appropriate review the court would permit those physician assisted suicides to occur.

There is an argument for the court to consider. That argument is that Parliament has a responsibility to grant somebody, through a change in legislation, a chance to exercise their rights. I am hoping that it will consider this approach.

The question becomes: Does an individual have this right? Does Sue Rodriguez have the right to ask her physician to assist her in a suicide? Let us look at some of the arguments. There certainly will be arguments put for and against it. We have to consider the fact that a very large number of Canadians would like to see something done by the government in this area.

There is the argument that this is a guarantee of liberty. The charter in section 7 guarantees that the individual has the right of self-determination. If a person does not have the right of self-determination to control their body, to refuse medication and medical treatment then it makes a mockery of the right to self-determination.

There was a recent article in the May 31 issue of *Time* magazine about Dr. Kevorkian in the United States. Dr. Kevorkian is operating virtually as a free agent, without control. The state of Michigan attempted to put a law in place to curtail his activity. The court has now overturned that and said that it is a denial of a person's right

to self-determination to commit suicide. That was the end of it.

• (1120)

That law has now been overturned and it looks as if Kevorkian can continue his practice, without any control whatsoever, over the kinds of activities in which he has been involved. This is unacceptable and really not a solution at all.

The argument is that this is a guarantee of liberty, that this legislation, if the government would accept it, would give Sue Rodriguez and a host of other Canadians who wish to pursue a physician assisted suicide the opportunity to be relieved from future pain and degradation and to have the right to control one's body. It is the right to avoid pain and suffering, and it is of course the right to avoid the indignity of a complete loss of ability to control any function of life.

When my colleague asks what right do they have, they do have rights. There is a right to liberty. There is a right to self-determination. There is a right to control one's body. There is a right to avoid pain and suffering. There is a right to avoid loss of dignity and there is even a right to commit suicide. The latter is not illegal. If a person wants another to assist them to commit suicide, we must consider this.

I would like to put forward another argument. The court originally dismissed this but it is certainly worthy of consideration. It is discriminatory, if there is an individual who is handicapped and one who is not, if the one individual who is handicapped by a chronic debilitating disease wishes to commit suicide, they may be impaired and unable to carry out that function without the assistance of a physician or someone else, preferably a physician.

There is a solid argument that one class of citizen because they are not disabled can in fact carry this out and another class of citizen who because of their disability may be competent mentally but unfortunately physically are unable to carry out the task competently. We wind up with a situation where we have created two classes of people by a law which essentially discriminates.

I would like the House to consider this legislation as empowerment, the ability of individuals to exert their own self-determination over their lives. These people are going to die, there is no question about it. They are going to die a painful and degrading death and they have made a decision that they wish to determine the time their life will end. Unfortunately, we remove that empowerment from them. We say that we know best. In this day and age I really think we must reconsider the current law.

We need to examine this issue, especially this narrow issue put in front of us by Sue Rodriguez. We must empower an individual who is in a very terrible set of circumstances. We must give them the power to exert some control over their lives, even if it is to relieve themselves of suffering and degradation. We must give that empowerment to them.

The ironic thing with Sue Rodriguez is that the progress of her disease will render her completely incapacitated. She will not be able to commit suicide and she will not be able to communicate. She will still be conscious but unfortunately unable to do anything.

If we were to pass a law that permitted physician assisted suicide and Sue Rodriguez and her physician agreed on the circumstances when the suicide would be carried out, Sue Rodriguez's life would be longer. She would be able to live longer. It is an irony. If she is going to commit suicide she will have to do it sooner, when she is capable of controlling the circumstances and doing it effectively, which means her life will be shorter unless she can use the assistance of a physician. It is not just Sue Rodriguez, it is all other Canadians who find themselves in this circumstance and who wish to end their lives in order to prevent that pain and suffering.

We could be in a position to extend their lives by amending that legislation.

I would also like to cite the case of Dr. Kevorkian in the United States.

• (1125)

Sue Rodriguez has a commitment from a physician regardless of the outcome. Whether Parliament or the government puts forward legislation in this House, whether the Supreme Court gives her the right, a physician has said that he will assist her to commit suicide. Ultimately this is a humanitarian act.

We have created a situation because the law is no longer relevant. This law is not relevant. The needs of society and the needs of people will begin to find ways to circumvent it to meet a very basic need.

We will lose control because we do not have any guidelines, for instance, in the arrangement between Sue Rodriguez and her physician or with the next case or the next one. There are no controls over Kevorkian types.

However we could set some very stringent controls; that you need to be terminally ill, that you need to be mentally competent, and you need to ask repeatedly to be assisted in committing suicide so that you can extend your life. Ultimately you would need to have it reviewed by an independent physician and by the Attorney General. Then some controls are placed over this type of situation.

I do not think we can create a situation where we provide disrespect for the law, where we are unable to enforce it. Physicians are not charged and convicted in Canada for carrying out this kind of activity. Therefore the law is already held in disrepute. It does not meet the needs of the people.

Sue Rodriguez has gone a step further and says: "I have made the arrangements if the court and Parliament are not able to meet our needs". We must do something about this. I am sure it would pass this House in short order if the government could bring forward a piece of legislation that would meet the needs of people.

The arguments against it are interesting. They fall into five categories. Murder is still murder. The issue of murder is still murder if you look at the definition. I guess the five basic points that the critics of it bring out is that murder is still murder. In this case that is not it and I will deal with that at length at a later date.

Another point is that Nazi Germany ran an euthanasia program and that we are heading in that direction. Nothing could be more false and misleading. This is a democracy. It is one of the most sensitive and successful democracies in the world.

The kind of activity we are looking at is not destroying people's lives because they do not meet the social agenda. We are responding to the requests to be able to be assisted with a suicide. We want to empower those people to control their lives.

We cannot argue against a religious conviction that says that no matter what, God created life and God has the ultimate choice as to when it will end. If a person holds those convictions you cannot deal with the issue if you totally ignore the situation that when a person's life is going to end anyway, and it is going to end with pain and degradation, we do have an opportunity to control it.

They say this is the slippery slope. This is the fourth argument. Opponents say that if we do this then we will end up lining up the elderly and finishing them off because it will be cheaper for our health care system. The argument is that we will move from there to other forms of incapacity. We cannot argue that. These are individuals asking for a right and asking to be able to time their lives.

The fifth argument is one of the most interesting ones and it comes from Dr. John Scott at the Elizabeth Bruyere Hospital. I guess one of the key points in his debate against it is this. He says: "If we put in a euthanasia system, even doctor assisted suicide, we will get into a situation where the Netherlands provide no money to hospice care and Great Britain which does not permit physician assisted suicide or euthanasia does provide money for hospice care".

This argument is completely false. Ultimately this caring society is concerned about health care. It is concerned about properly funding hospices for the same reason it would give Sue Rodriguez empowerment and the right to self-determination.

If an individual wishes to end his or her life in a hospice situation we have an obligation and a responsibility to make sure that health care spending provides the opportunity to do that.

This is the last chance. Eighty per cent of Canadians want to see something done about this. Sue Rodriguez and her physician will do something about it, whether we permit it or not. I think respect for the law is critical and respect for the rights of other human beings is critical in this issue.

• (1130)

Mrs. Barbara Sparrow (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, this motion of the member for North Island—Powell River on legislation to allow physician assisted suicide raises the issue of euthanasia on request where the

patient is no longer able to act, or should there be a distinction.

I am not aware that the medical profession in Canada has asked the government to decriminalize either physician assisted suicide or euthanasia. The reason may very well be that it does not recognize these practices as constituting the practice of medicine. The proper concern of medicine is with treatment, including palliative treatment to relieve pain.

There is a great deal of confusion on whether there is a need for decriminalization and on whether it commands general support. This is complicated by the fact that the media has not always distinguished between euthanasia on request and plain murder.

Moreover palliative treatment to relieve pain which has the effect of hastening death has often also been included in the euthanasia debate, even though courts have indicated that this is not a crime. That is because in such circumstances the disease, rather than the treatment, is considered to be the legal cause of death.

In the face of all this confusion it is not surprising that opinion polls report a majority in favour of something or another. However when one asks what the respondent understands when opinion polls present the question, it is obvious that not only the respondent but also the pollster has failed to appreciate the wide range of very different situations that could be included in the general type of questions favoured by those conducting the polls on this very hotly contested issue.

Once this is understood we may find there is no need and little demand for decriminalization of physician assisted suicide and euthanasia. Once a person is assured of effective palliative treatment to relieve pain he or she is much less likely to demand that these practices be made available.

As a practical matter, court decisions have made it clear that not only is palliative treatment which hastens death not a crime, but neither is removing a respirator at the request of a patient. Similarly, withdrawing food and drugs from patients in a persistent vegetative state at the request of the patient's family has been recognized as an extension of the patient's own right to refuse treatment.

Doctors are aware that in all these situations treatment has not been successful and since they cannot offer any further useful treatment, they are willing to accept the decision of the patient or his family to cease treatment.

The medical profession remains by and large opposed to physician assisted suicide and euthanasia. They are aware of the implications of decriminalization. Just as there are specialties in medicine, so we have seen there are doctors who are prepared to bring their death machines to assist people to commit suicide. No doubt a specialty in assisted suicide and euthanasia would develop if the practices cease to be prohibited by the criminal law.

What is absent from the arguments of those promoting these practices is consideration of how decriminalization would affect the plight of children or other persons who are incapable of requesting assisted suicide or euthanasia. Once these facts are available to those who can consent to them they may well be extended to those who are not in a position to request them.

These acts would go beyond withdrawal of treatment that has proven unsuccessful. They would reverse the ancient medical injunction to do no harm and would involve the doctor in deliberately doing harm. They would foist on the medical profession a philosophical position that says killing is better than allowing suffering. In those processes the alternate to accept the challenge to develop the art of palliative treatment to a point where no one need suffer and no one need be killed to avoid suffering may all be ignored.

• (1135)

What is even worse and equally incompatible with our principles of criminal law and our principles of human rights is the fact that euthanasia could eventually be administered to those who are incapable of either consenting or refusing. The only basis for administering euthanasia to these people would be their chronic or terminal illnesses.

There have been prosecutions of doctors in England for acts which in the Netherlands would be prosecuted as euthanasia. Some have failed for lack of evidence.

A doctor was recently convicted of attempted murder and was subsequently found guilty of unprofessional conduct by the general medical council. They found that the criminal conviction was sufficient punishment and declined to remove his licence to practice. However, the

regional medical council put very strict conditions on his future work.

Some doctors resented the verdict of the court because euthanasia had been requested by the patient and her family. However it was clear that the doctor did not administer a drug aimed at relieving pain but rather a drug aimed only at killing the patient.

This case emphasizes the fact that the criminal law prohibition against euthanasia as murder plays a very necessary role in helping the medical profession regulate itself. It educates the profession in what the law, which reflects social values, regards as permissible and what goes beyond the boundaries of societal acceptance.

Had the doctor administered a drug aimed at relieving pain and the patient died as a secondary effect, provided he did not act in a negligent manner, he would not have been prosecuted.

It was made clear in a jury direction many years ago and was recently confirmed in this decision in the English Court of Appeal that such a case of the law regards the death to be from the disease and not from the attempt to alleviate the pain.

The consequence of this educational and regulatory effect of the criminal law is that members of the medical profession are encouraged to improve their ability to provide effective palliative care, to secure the knowledge they are not going to be in conflict with the law. In contrast, medical practitioners in the Netherlands are really not encouraged to improve their ability to provide effective palliative care because in appropriate circumstances, they may act directly to kill the patient.

I personally think the way to go is to improve our palliative care methods. There is a great deal more we can do in society within the medical profession to alleviate the pain of those suffering. I cannot and do not support the member's motion.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, as I begin my remarks I notice some of the members presently in the House. I see at least two members who are medical graduates. I see a former teacher of nursing. I see former clergymen and a number of others. All I am sure are interested in this topic.

• (1140)

I want to take a moment to talk about this issue of euthanasia. It is an issue about which I have very profound feelings. Euthanasia is so–called mercy killing. Presumably under certain conditions it would be seen as being merciful. It also means a good death.

By definition, that kind of a death must then be potentially good. Those who are in favour of it are in favour of merciful killing and good death. Obviously those of us who are against it presumably do not want all these good and merciful things. One can see how quickly one can fall into that trap, particularly when all of this only rests on the abuse of a few words in the dictionary.

Until recently euthanasia was not even legal in a country such as Holland. We all know that Holland practises more euthanasia than any other country on the face of the earth. It has one–quarter of Canada's population and up to 12,000 people per year are sent to premature death in that country.

On February 9, 1993 the Dutch parliament formally adopted so–called voluntary euthanasia. A week later a Dutch justice department spokesperson, Liesbeth Rensman, told the Associated Press that legislators would be studying the effect of this voluntary euthanasia law for three months. This would be done to "see what happens and how careful physicians are, then perhaps there could be regulation for killing without request". If you do not think we are on a slippery slope when we discuss this issue, think again.

I want to speak about the medical profession in all of this. First it is important to remind everyone that we are not talking about patients who refuse medical treatment. In fact that is already protected by section 265 of the Criminal Code and a colleague who invoked that as a reason for euthanasia was obviously wrong. That is already covered in the Criminal Code. We are talking about giving physicians the right to kill, pure and simple, albeit under certain conditions.

In the sixth century BC, the Greek philosopher Hippocrates wrote a note to which physicians are still bound today. It states in part: "I will give no deadly medicine to anyone if asked, nor suggest such counsel". In modern times, that particular Hippocratic oath has been rewritten as the declaration of Geneva. The declaration of Geneva repeats the same idea in different words.

Physicians have operated under these oaths for 2,500 years. These oaths are there because patients need the assurance that a doctor's only *raison d'être* is to make them better, never to make them worse. Doctors operate under the motto: First do no harm. What would euthanasia do to all that? What would it do to the trust that exists between a patient and a doctor?

I never question my doctor's intention, none of us do. If we did for just the slightest moment, obviously we would change physicians. Most of us never change physicians. We have the same physician for years and years. Why do we do that? Because we trust physicians. We sometimes agree or disagree with a particular treatment they might have given us. We have never ever asked ourselves: Is my physician there to do me good or harm? We take it as a given that the physician's role will always be to make it better. I do not want to see that eroded.

I want to talk a bit about the slippery slope. Dr. Robert Conot, the author of *Justice at Nuremberg*, has reminded us of what can happen when a society allows itself to be guided by strictly utilitarian rather than humanitarian principles.

• (1145)

In Weimar, Germany, not Nazi Germany, the mentally and physically ill were entitled to the so-called favour of painless death. This principle was subsequently extended to other useless eaters, including residents of homes for the aged. The Nazis then extended the concept afterward to include Jews, Slavs and others who they felt were not useful to the party in power. That is how it began in that particular country.

How did that society slide that way? To quote Dr. Conot: "Theirs"—the Nazis—"was no plunge to damnation from conscious decision but a step-by-step descent into darkness, each step marking a small erosion of ethics and morality". That is how they slid into that.

Some members in this House might disagree with me about the slippery slope, but then what? I believe that euthanasia would still be wrong because it cheapens human life.

Only a few days ago we learned through the media that a Dutch psychiatrist was acquitted after injecting a depressed patient with a lethal substance. How could we tell our fellow citizens that murder is wrong if we were to permit doctors to do it? How could we tell our young and emotionally fragile citizens that suicide is wrong and that life is precious if we allow life to be destroyed in this kind of a cavalier manner?

The Criminal Code of Canada forbids aiding, counselling or assisting a suicide. I believe it does so because the absence of such rules would erode the patient-doctor trust, as I said previously, but it does so as well because killing is wrong.

There is even a third reason. I want to quote from a reference made in report No. 58 of the Law Reform Commission which states: "The law does not exist for the sole or primary purpose of punishing illicit acts. It exists as an expression in a broad sense of the kind of people that we are. It does not merely regulate our behaviour; it articulates and symbolizes our values and our beliefs". That is why there is that prohibition in the Criminal Code.

Even if members disagree with me as to the other reasons, even if they do not think there is a slippery slope in spite of the evidence to the contrary, even if they do not believe that Holland exists as a nation with its experience in spite of evidence to the contrary, then I hope that all of us could surely agree that the reason the law is there is to state those things we think are valuable.

Some will say: "It is easy for you, Boudria. Maybe you have not lived with this very much". Actually about a year and a week ago my wife lost her mother to terminal cancer. A year almost to the day before, I lost my father as a result of a malignant brain tumour. That certainly was not easy, but that does not mean I now favour euthanasia. It means quite the opposite. It means that I understand even better how precious and fragile life is.

Collectively and individually we must make statements in this House about the value and dignity of human life. We must not say things to cheapen it any more than it has been already.

Mr. Robert Wenman (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, this is one of the more important issues that has come before the House of Commons. That the discussion has begun in this session of Parliament for the first time is important. If not in this Parliament certainly by the next Parliament it will lead to changes before the law. It is inevitable because the majority of people, the nature of medical technology and many other factors are driving us in a direction that calls for discussion, reason and

resolution. Therefore I have no doubt the law will be changed.

• (1150)

All points of view are important in the ideas we put forward today. To me this is about freedom, self-determination and very much about fear. I appreciated the comments of the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell. I appreciated that he personalized them. This is an issue that needs to be personalized because it affects every one of us. As an issue which affects every one of us, we need to consider it in our own context.

I can appreciate the choices that the hon. member for Calgary and the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell may have made for themselves and their families. Those choices may have been that when they face terminal illness, they want to prolong life as long as medical science can do so, even if it is prolonging life through and into intense suffering.

That is their choice for them and their families. I do not agree with that choice for me or my family. I believe that God gave us medical science and technology to improve the quality of our life, to nurture, protect and prolong to the point where we say: "That is enough, let me go, let me withdraw from treatment and leave it between my God and myself to make that decision".

We seem to have moved somewhat since we started this debate on my Bill C-203. Everyone seems to recognize fully that there should be the right to withdraw from treatment in the law to the point that we are claiming that it exists. The court cases demonstrate that it does not necessarily exist and needs clarification. The courts have called upon Parliament to clarify the law. The first result of the Rodriguez hearing told us that this is a decision for the Parliament of Canada, not a decision for the medical profession or the courts.

Let us look at what we agree to under the law. We agree, I think almost unanimously, that anyone who becomes terminally ill, that means you and I, has the right to withdraw from treatment. But we do not have the right to withdraw from suffering. In other words, technically one can withdraw from treatment if one wants to suffer to the point of death.

Mrs. Stewart: That is ridiculous.

Mr. Wenman: I am not finished yet. You are right. That is not the whole side. The practice of most caring medical professional people is that they will err on the side of relieving suffering and in so doing, on occasion or even often, will allow that life to go at the point when suffering becomes excessive.

• (1155)

I would like to see the practice made legal so that the choice is for everyone to make. If I were to become terminally ill I would want my life preserved as long as possible. I would use all the medical technology I could to extend my life. But I believe there is a point in suffering where I would want to be able to say as a mature, responsible adult: "That is enough, let me go. Help me go". I would want to use the technology available to us through medical science to let me choose to say that is enough and let me go.

It is unfortunate that this is a decision question. Who will make the decision? Will it be your doctor, will it be your family, will it be yourself or will it be God? What is the combination?

One of the problems right now is that everybody sits around the deathbed arguing about who should make the decision, or saying nothing because that is easier than arguing. It goes on and on and on. People feel great pity and empathy. They feel sad but they cannot make a decision. That is why there should be the right of the individual to make a rational, logical choice through access to medical technology which will allow us to terminate our own life when there is no further hope.

This is not just what I think, it is what the court has declared. The court has declared that it needs direction. From where? From Parliament, from here, from us. We have to overcome our fear of this subject and deal with it, and we all have that fear in varying degrees.

Some people compare it to the abortion issue. Tie it in. It has nothing to do with the abortion issue. In the case of abortion we are talking about two people's lives, the life of the child and the life of the mother. In that case it is easy for me. It is a matter of nurturing, preserving and protecting that life.

However, when we are talking about the end of our lives as mature responsible adults in the face of medical technology, I want to be protected by and for and against that technology, technology that wants to overly prolong my suffering and which will not allow me to make the decision in an appropriate manner through law.

Why do we not then put that decision back into the hands of the doctors? Do we put it in the hands of the individual? Why not decriminalize it and let each doctor, each individual make his or her own choice? Am I not responsible or intelligent enough to make that choice? I think I am. And I resent that any government or other parliamentarians would deny me that right of choice.

Death for many is not death; it is a release to eternal life. Why would any Christian try to prevent that release to eternal life?

I have made a great many arguments but am out of time to make those again in Bill C–203. But they will be made, if not by this Parliament then by the next Parliament, because the people of Canada demand that we make the change.

Mr. Jesse Flis (Parkdale—High Park): Mr. Speaker, I see by the clock that I only have a minute left in the debate. I would like to use that minute in putting on record a letter I received from two constituents, Helen and Mary Burnie. They say:

• (1200)

Dear Mr. Flis:

Thank you for helping to defeat Waddell's death bill. We have become so obsessed with death that we no longer see the beauty of life.

I am a terminally ill person and I want to live my full life allotted to me by God. May God bless you.

The hon. member says that the courts are seeking direction from Parliament. My constituents are giving the courts direction through this Parliament and through me as their representative.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired. Pursuant to Standing Order 96(1), the item is dropped from the Order Paper.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CANADA LABOUR CODE

MEASURE TO AMEND

Hon. Marcel Danis (Minister of Labour) moved that Bill C–101, an act to amend the Canada Labour Code and the Public Service Staff Relations Act, be read the third time and passed.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Commons committee on its excellent work in examining Bill C–101, an act to amend the Canada Labour Code and the Public Service Staff Relations Act.

I would also thank all members of the House as well as representatives of labour, business and government organizations who have made a substantial number of presentations to the committee.

A great deal of discussion has taken place during the preparation of the bill presented to the House today which I believe is a balanced package of amendments to the Canada Labour Code. These amendments when implemented should help Canadian business compete in world markets by reducing red tape while offering workers improved protection in the area of labour standards and greater uniformity of treatment and benefits across the country.

[*Translation*]

These amendments are a balanced package from which employers, employees and the government will benefit and which will protect the public interest. I am convinced that passing this bill will give workers the security and confidence they need to work more productively, while striking a balance between their responsibilities at work and at home.

This bill will help employers by streamlining and simplifying the administrative procedures under the Canada Labour Code and will thus make them more competitive. It will enhance compatibility of federal and provincial legislation, so that employees across the land will receive similar treatment and benefits. Finally, this bill will protect the public interest by offering another mechanism to facilitate the settlement of collective bargaining conflicts in federal jurisdiction.

[*English*]

The majority of the amendments relate to part III, the labour standards section of the Canada Labour Code. These proposals were developed over two years of consultation with federally regulated employer and employee representatives, the very parties affected by the changes.

Some 700,000 working Canadians will benefit from these changes to federal labour standards. The bill will streamline procedures for modifications to labour standards such as provide for the substitution of a general holiday, clarify the relationship between the minimum labour standards and collective agreements, provide for more effective collection of unpaid wages, provide wage and employment protection for workers injured on the job, allow greater flexibility in the timing of parental leave, and support a pregnant worker's right to remain at work by requiring employers to make every reasonable effort to modify the job or reassign the employee when her temporary health needs so require.

I would like to give further information on the last two points. Provisions that provide for protective reassignment for pregnant and nursing workers and those that allow greater flexibility in the scheduling of parental leave are especially important.

• (1205)

The amendments concerning the scheduling of parental leave address the difficulties that working families face in balancing their responsibilities at home with those in the work place. Under the provisions of Bill C–101 either parent within the federal jurisdiction will be able to take the parental leave to which he or she is entitled at any time within a year after the child's birth or after the child comes into the employee's care.

The amendment acknowledges that the circumstances and needs of parents differ. It is only equitable to offer some flexibility in the way that parental leave may be taken.

[*Translation*]

The amendments concerning maternity–related reassignment will protect women's right to continue working. An employer will no longer be able to force a woman employee to take maternity leave simply because she is pregnant. Under the new provisions, employers must, as much as possible, change the duties of the pregnant woman or reassign her if her doctor considers that essential.

Forty per cent of federally regulated employees are women and, every year, about 6,700 of them take maternity leave. The amendments proposed in Bill C–101 will have a positive impact on many of these women by enabling them to continue to earn a living. By keeping qualified and experienced employees at work, the whole Canadian economy will benefit.

[*English*]

The amendments to the industrial relations provisions of the Canada Labour Code and the Public Service Staff Relations Act will serve the public interest by providing an additional mechanism which could assist in the settlement of collective bargaining disputes. The provisions would be invoked only when the action is likely to result in the resolution of a collective bargaining dispute where the public interest is affected.

Each component of Bill C–101 received a full discussion in the committee hearings. We had excellent representation from many members of both the government and opposition sides of the House, the Canadian Labour Congress, la Confédération des syndicats nationaux, a number of public sector unions, the chairman of the Public Service Staff Relations Board, and business organizations such as the Canadian Bankers' Association and FETCO which represents the federally regulated employers in the transportation and communications industries.

These were lively and fruitful discussions conducted in a spirit of co–operation that I found very encouraging. Some thoughtful suggestions were put forward by a number of representatives who appeared before us. We listened carefully and considered all of them.

I urge the House to support the bill. As a whole these amendments will be contributing to the efficiency of Canadian work places while promoting great co–operation between employers and employees. The changes will help Canada achieve a more progressive labour–management climate and will promote a more equitable and harmonious work place. This should have a benefi-

cial impact on the competitiveness of Canadian industry and the prosperity of Canadian workers.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank members of the committee who worked in a very harmonious way. With the support of members of the House and the other place I hope we can get this legislation into place very soon.

Mrs. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West): Mr. Speaker, this is an important bill. As the minister has said, in large measure it is the result of good consultation among the government, the employers and the unions representing employees in the federal sector.

As far as it goes in that direction it is an example of the importance of good management–labour relations, both in the interest of Canada remaining competitive, having a stable work environment and being able to deliver on its commitments internationally, and in the interest of what the government likes to call a partnership relationship between employers and employees that leads to more productive and more efficient work places. The government seems to understand this intellectually but continues to have a problem with fully committing to implementing the development of better management–labour relationships in Canada.

• (1210)

As they get down to the wire on actually doing something positive in this area, the devil inside that says all labour unions are bad seems to get in the way. It causes them to do that bit extra that again creates an atmosphere of confrontation and undermines the progress that has been made toward more productive partnerships.

Let me make it clear what I am speaking about. The bill contains two essential elements. As the minister has said, one is provisions that were negotiated and were the subject of lengthy discussions and very productive consultations between employee representatives and employer representatives in the federally regulated sector.

These are the provisions that relate to conditions of work, occupational health and safety issues relating to pregnant or nursing women, to employees who have become injured or disabled, parental leave and so on. Where the partnership model was followed and the consultation was carried through there was consensus, agreement and a large measure of support for the bill.

Regrettably the government found it necessary to abandon that consultative process entirely and introduce an entirely new element into the bill before bringing it into the House, that is the provision of a forced vote among the membership of the union on a last offer. I do not know why the government chose to undermine the consultative process, the very positive atmosphere that had developed among government, labour, management and employers on this issue, by dropping this element into the bill at the last minute. Nonetheless it did.

It is on the basis of the negative effect we think the provision will have on the continued development of a positive climate of management–labour–government relationships that we will be voting against the bill.

Let me go back to the first package of amendments that we certainly support. The fact they have wide support is a tribute to the consultative process and to all those who participated in it. It provides for work place redeployment of women who are pregnant or nursing in the interest of their health and the health of either their born or unborn child. It also provides similar measures for workers injured or disabled as a result of their employment.

The positive result is the likelihood of keeping workers employed, adapting the work place so that they can continue to be employed and self–sufficient, rather than take advantage of various disability programs that are seldom satisfactory to either party.

We entirely support these provisions. We entirely support the greater flexibility of parental leave. If we want to keep a productive skilled work force, we know that increasingly the work place, public sector or private sector has to make accommodation for a better balance among personal, family and work responsibilities.

However we fail to understand why the government does not recognize that those are equally valuable provisions for approximately one–third of the 700,000 federally regulated employees it talked about, the third who are employees of the government, the Public Service of Canada.

• (1215)

We fail to understand why the government would not have accepted an amendment put forward by Liberal

members of the legislative committee to apply those same positions to employees in the Public Service.

We think nursing and pregnant women in the Public Service deserve the same entitlement and rights as nursing and pregnant women in the private sector. We think that parents or those who are about to be parents deserve the same conditions of work in the Public Service as those about to be parents or parents in the private sector.

These are provisions which private sector employees have accepted. These are provisions which they are now legally obliged to adhere to. Yet these are provisions the federal government is not prepared to apply to itself as an employer.

It is this kind of double standard that has increasingly raised the ire of business and employer organizations. They see the government imposing requirements on the private sector as employer that it has failed to take unto itself.

We were surprised by the government refusing this amendment because the government at least in words has said it is interested in getting rid of regulations. These kinds of conditions for the Public Service are covered in volumes of policies and programs at least 10 feet high. This would have been a great opportunity to get rid of that kind of policy regulation regime and put people's entitlements very clearly into legislation.

We are really surprised in the deregulating atmosphere that the government seems to be promoting that it still wants to maintain these volumes and volumes of policy manuals and regulation that have to be cross-referenced time and time again with respect to its own employees.

I want to speak now about the second major provision of the bill which is the right of the Minister of Labour to refer a last offer to a vote of the employees. I want to make quite clear that this provision was dropped into the legislation at the last moment with no consultation whatsoever. I think the minister concedes that.

The minister was asked during the course of the legislative committee why this came up after the consultations were over on this piece of legislation and why he felt he needed this kind of tool. The best answer that he could come up with was he had seen how useful it was to Premier Rae in ending the TTC strike in Toronto. He thought it might be a useful tool to have in the government's arsenal.

What it is in fact is an undue undermining of the whole rules of the game of collective bargaining. Collective bargaining works when there is a reasonable balance of interest and of clout between the employer and the union representing the employees.

When the rules of the game are clear you sit down and you bargain. That is the way you reach a collective agreement. Instead the government now wants to be able to intervene at any time and say the process is not working, which gives either side an out. It takes off the pressure to sit down, negotiate and come to a mutually acceptable conclusion.

We were particularly concerned about the application of this rule to the Public Service because the government already has such substantial clout over its own employees that it enjoys an undue power to undermine the collective bargaining process and to resolve issues and disputes by mutual consent. It enjoys the power to exclude any of its employees from the bargaining unit in the public interest, in the interest of public health and safety.

• (1220)

It does so most generously to ensure that at times of labour or management disruption there are continuing public services. It enjoys the right at any time by legislation to send employees back to work, to dictate the terms of their employment, as this government has done a minimum of three times in this session of Parliament.

We fail to see why it needs this additional power to send an offer to a vote of the employees directly and bypass a negotiating process with the unions when it already enjoys such tremendous power. The only reason can possibly be to avoid public debate in this House on the usefulness and the propriety of its actions when it does want to order people back to work. It now has another mechanism that it can use without ever coming to this House and allowing this House to debate what is in the public interest.

The second element that makes this a different issue in the Public Service is that the government is the employer. Therefore, it should not have the right under any proper concept of collective bargaining as one party to the negotiations to determine how those negotiations will proceed.

A minister of the Crown is in the position that I am sure the president of General Motors or any other major corporate head would love to be in of being able to decide to bypass the union completely and go directly to the members. But that is not the way collective bargaining works. It is undermining the role of unions in the collective bargaining process and that fits with the ideology of the government.

What it does not do is serve the public interest well in the long run. Nor does it serve the employees who belong to a democratic organization and who are responsible themselves for determining whether their union is or is not representing them well. That is not up to the employer, the other side of the table, to determine.

We did hear some excellent representations before the legislative committee. I regret first that the government felt obliged to introduce an unpopular, unwelcome, undiscussed measure into this bill at the last moment and then refused to remove those provisions.

Second, I regret very much that despite the excellent representations before the committee, it has chosen not to apply the same working conditions to its own employees as it forces private sector employers to provide.

Third, I regret that it has saddled the future government with a system that is unworkable and simply will not be helpful to the collective bargaining process.

An hon. member: That is because it is leaving office.

Mrs. Catterall: It is a system that undermines the commitment that both employer and workers must have to the bargaining table as the place to resolve issues, to that process as the way of maintaining stability in both public and private sector employment and to that process as the foundation of developing a more co-operative partnership among employers, workers and government, if this country is going to remain competitive, increase productivity and be ready to be able to face the challenges of the future.

Ms. Joy Langan (Mission—Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here today to once again discuss Bill C-101. As you know, this bill was introduced in December of last year. Today we are discussing third reading of the bill.

The amendments to the Canada Labour Code, parts II and III, were the result of over two years of consultation, as you heard the minister say, with employer groups and unions. Neither side in this discussion got everything they wanted but a consensus was reached.

• (1225)

For the most part, we have here needed improvements to the Canada Labour Code. We have improvements in the protection for pregnant and nursing women in the work place. We have improvements in parental leave provisions. We have improvements in protection for injured workers. We have improvements in the administration of the code to speed up the determination of workers' rights and we have improvements in wage protection for workers.

As stated here and in the committee hearings, we also have the regressive step of a ministerial ordered vote on the employer's last offer. This measure which applies to both private and public sector workers came about without consultation, without consensus and most obviously without any stated need from either the private sector employers or the unions.

Its inclusion in this bill will not improve labour relations in federal jurisdiction. The reason it is there has nothing to do with labour relations in federal jurisdiction. It is there to simply advance an ideological position that holds that the employer must have more rights than the workers in the collective bargaining process.

In the legislative committee we heard from the Minister of Labour and the minister responsible for Canada Post. We heard from 10 witnesses, 7 from labour, 2 from the employers, as well as the chair of the Public Service Staff Relations Board. With the exception of the two ministers, we did not hear from one person who supported the directed vote amendments to the Canada Labour Code and the Public Service Staff Relations Act.

A recent ruling by the Canada Labour Relations Board points to one of the difficulties in holding these types of votes. The Canada Labour Code does not prohibit the use of scabs. The directed vote provision of this bill does not define who is in the bargaining unit and who is not.

In hearing a certification application by a company union, the CLRB considered scabs to be part of the existing bargaining unit. This opens the way for the company to lock out its workers, hire scabs, await the call of the vote by the minister and be assured of effectively decertifying the bargaining agent by stacking the vote

with scabs or, as the government prefers to call them, replacement workers.

This is not some sort of a curiosity when the CLRB has said that there exists a community of interest between the scabs and those who are on strike. The CLRB has said that scabs are members of a bargaining unit. In effect the CLRB has said that it is okay for the employer to attempt to break the certified union by hiring scabs. Taking this decision at face value and applying it to the directed vote provisions of this bill, we can see a reactionary shift in the direction of labour relations in Canada.

The CLRB is saying that the employer can hire scabs with impunity and that they become part of the bargaining unit. The government is saying that it can direct a vote on the employer's last offer to be taken by the bargaining unit. What is apparent therefore is that the collective bargaining relationship is being stacked in favour of the employer. The CLRB is redefining the bargaining unit; the government is defining what the offer is going to be.

Implicit in the government initiated amendments to part I of the code and the Public Service Staff Relations Act is the belief on the part of the government that the union or bargaining team does not represent the interests or the will of the membership. This directed vote is saying that the government or the minister knows better than the elected and accountable union executive or bargaining team what is in the best interest of the union membership at the bargaining table.

Such an anti-democratic inference should have no place in legislation enacted by the House of Commons. To suppose an arbitrary decision by the Minister of Labour is a superior process to those democratic structures of trade unions is offensive and calls into question the sincerity of this government's commitment to the collective bargaining process. It calls into question the commitment of the government to upholding the rights of the worker-controlled, democratic work place institutions and trade unions.

• (1230)

The existence of this provision in the code also poses a severe threat to the fundamental right of workers to withdraw their labour. By giving the minister the right to intervene at any time—it is important to note that is at any time—after notice to collective bargaining has been given, it effectively allows the minister to circumvent the free collective bargaining process as well as the right to strike.

From a strictly pragmatic perspective the problem of carrying out a vote within a large bargaining unit such as the Canadian Union of Postal Workers is absolutely immense. There will be the problem of determining who is an eligible worker, finding the correct addresses, dealing with appeals by both the employer and the union as to who should be included and who should not and most important, how such a process is to be carried out if it is Canada Post that is behind a picket line.

Is the government going to order the workers back to work so that ballots can be delivered, so that workers can vote to reject the employer's last offer and so that they can go back to the picket line? As an example, in the CUPW certification vote a number of years ago it took over five months just to prepare the list of eligible voters. Is a five-month delay going to enhance the collective bargaining process or help find a resolution? I think not.

Yet another problem arises when one has to determine just what is the employer's last offer. Is it the last complete offer? Is it an amalgamation of offers? Will it include what is still outstanding as well as what has been agreed upon? Who is to determine what the last offer is? In collective bargaining there is always much posturing on one side or the other in terms of what was the last offer.

In the last round of CUPW/Canada Post bargaining there were at least three offers put on the table that the employer claimed was its final offer. The bill calls for a vote to include all matters remaining in dispute, but often in collective bargaining the less contentious issues are dealt with first and the more difficult ones are set aside. In most cases this means that wage offers are the last to be determined.

What this bill does is to allow the employer to agree to non-monetary issues and then throw out a wage offer that is non-negotiable claiming it to be the last offer. Intimidation will become part of the process. Will employers have the right to put out advertisements which purport to be the last offer? Will spouses of workers be contacted directly as in the past in the hope that they will influence their partner into accepting the

employer's last offer? The employer's message will be simply: "Ratify or else".

This is not collective bargaining. It is intimidation and coercion. The government claims there is nothing sinister here. It claims that this is simply another tool to assist the collective bargaining process. Nothing could be further from the truth.

In committee we had the pleasure of hearing not only the Minister of Labour but also the minister responsible for Canada Post who was very gleeful about the fact that these two clauses, 2 and 42, were his idea and his babies. It was clear from any reading of the transcripts that the real target of the government with this bill was the Canadian Union of Postal Workers and with the amendment to the Public Service Staff Relations Act, the Public Service Alliance of Canada and the Professional Institute of the Public Service of Canada.

It is indeed disheartening to see public policy developed in this country that serves no purpose other than to satisfy the vindictiveness of a particular member of cabinet. In this instance it was the minister responsible for Canada Post who, as I said, was quite clear about why he introduced the amendments.

It is difficult to forget given the number of times it has been used but it has to be remembered that the government still retains the right to legislate workers and employers back to work.

In the case of public sector workers the government already has extensive powers to ensure essential services. Unlike provincial jurisdictions the bargaining units covered by part I of the Canada Labour Code are quite large. There is CUPW at Canada Post. There are the bargaining units in the railways and airlines. There are the units in telecommunications.

In the case of a serious threat to the public welfare the government can and has ordered the resumption of the enterprise and the involvement of a mediator and/or arbitrator. This is done quickly. Necessary services are restored and the collective bargaining process is either ended with an imposed settlement or the parties are placed into an arbitration process that will result in a collective agreement.

• (1235)

With this directed vote provision there is no speed to the resolution process and there is no involvement of a mediator. The collective bargaining process is simply stalled to the detriment of all.

One must ask just what the point is when all the evidence we have heard demonstrates that from a collective bargaining perspective the directed vote is an unwarranted intrusion. From a strictly practical perspective its use is simply unworkable and extraordinarily expensive.

What is clear is that this provision is politically motivated and is not another mechanism to assist in the collective bargaining process.

If the government was sincere in wanting to enhance the collective bargaining process it would have put all of part I of the Canada Labour Code on the table during the consultative process. It would have followed the lead of B.C. and Ontario and banned the use of scabs. As we saw during the lengthy Nationair dispute and as we continue to witness in the ongoing dispute in Yellowknife, the use of scabs has not only lengthened the dispute but it has also strengthened the resolve of employers bent on breaking a union.

With regard to the directed vote amendment in the Public Service Staff Relations Act one has to question where the employer, in this instance the government, goes with public sector bargaining if it is required to vote on the last offer and the workers say no. Where does the government go? The chairman of the Public Service Staff Relations Board told the legislative committee that this clause is totally unworkable and that if implemented it would cost $2 million to $3 million to undertake the vote. The government has chosen to ignore that expert information and we are still faced with those clauses in this legislation.

I want to address some of the amendments that were made in committee. It should be noted that improvements to this bill were made in committee in large part due to the witnesses from organized labour whom we heard. They suggested amendments. At this point I would like to thank the Minister of Labour for agreeing to those amendments.

Clause 30 of Bill C-101 as originally drafted was intended to remedy the situation where pregnant women, being denied illness benefits while on maternity leave, were protected. The Supreme Court of Canada ruled in the case of Brooks *v.* Canada Safeway that an employee benefit plan which denied illness benefits was discriminatory and therefore in contradiction of Canadian human rights law.

We found that while the Department of Labour recognized that such insurance plans were discriminatory, the wording of the bill did not make it as clear as it might have that those plans which continue this discriminatory action were illegal.

I then proposed new wording which was adopted by the legislative committee which clarifies the intent of this change to the Canada Labour Code. Again the minister agreed to the wording. It is now very clear that employee-employer insurance plans cannot discriminate against pregnant women.

One other clause of this bill was changed by the committee and that was clause 40. I proposed an amendment to make it clear that regulations can be made to regulate those deductions an employer is permitted to make from a worker's pay cheque.

My concern here was about the case of overpayments made to an employee or losses that an employee is solely responsible for. Take, for example, shortage of cash in a bank teller's cash drawer if he or she had sole control over that cash drawer. Regulations could be drafted to ensure that any recovery of these moneys not be done all at once.

These regulations that are now permissible under the legislation will protect workers and ensure that they continue to receive an appropriate wage during the period of repayment. Hopefully the guidelines will be something like 10 per cent per pay period.

We are however disappointed that the government did not agree with the second reading amendment of the member for Laurier—Sainte-Marie. That amendment essentially outlined that if there is better protection, particularly for pregnant women, in provincial jurisdiction then the provincial jurisdiction would apply. This is the case in Quebec.

Despite the many gains we find in this bill achieved through consultation and through working together, the New Democrats cannot support it. We cannot support it because we believe that it was underhanded, unwarranted and unnecessary to create and have the addition of the directed vote provisions to the Canada Labour Code and the Public Service Staff Relations Act.

• (1240)

They were introduced without consultation or provocation. They were introduced in fact without the support of any of the parties who were involved in the consultation process.

Because we believe legislation enacted in this House should uphold and reflect the general public interest, we cannot support this legislation. The laws we enact should be used to expand and protect the rights of Canadians. They should not, as we see in clauses 2 and 42 in this bill, expand the arbitrary powers of the cabinet.

The consultative process that resulted in most of what we see in Bill C-101 is testimony to an effective, if not somewhat lengthy, legislative process. Client groups working with departmental officials can produce consensual law that fits the needs of those workers covered by the Canada Labour Code. Those who will benefit most from the Canada Labour Code are those workers not covered by collective agreements and those who depend on the code to protect their rights as workers.

It remains however very disheartening that these benefits are tainted by the government's last minute decision to take one more shot at those unions in the public and private sector who have stood up to the government in defence of the rights of their members.

It is disappointing that the consultative portion of this bill must be voted against in order for us to give a clear message to this government that the imposition of amendments that constitute clauses 2 and 42 are repugnant to New Democrats, to my caucus and also to working Canadians.

Mr. Raymond Skelly (North Island—Powell River): Mr. Speaker, I share the concerns expressed by my colleague from Mission—Coquitlam about the inadequacies of the legislation. I would like to ask her if she could respond to this particular problem which is a general difficulty with the Canada Labour Code.

There is a long-term employee at the Port Hardy airport who has been there since 1975, a gentleman by the name of Joe Davey. As time goes on, he is at an age where we all begin to slow down. He was ordered to take on fire-fighting duties apart from his normal job as machine operator. It was not in his job description. They

then decided he was not fit to do that and arbitrarily placed him on medical leave.

Joe Davey wound up on welfare, could not get back into the job and was off for about a year. Then they got rid of that fire-fighting requirement. He came back to work. He has a degenerative disc problem in his back. Physicians have said that he can go back to work but he cannot spend eight hours a day digging in a ditch—he is a machine operator—as his back will not handle it. He is off again. The manager has said he is on leave.

The personnel services are looking at this and they refuse to deal with it. He is a long-term employee who can go back to work, yet they have placed him in this tenuous situation. The occupational health and safety people have taken a much broader look at it and have said that there is lots of room for him in there. In fact they are putting people into lighter duties who have lower seniority and are less qualified than he is.

However, the two arms of Transport Canada do not deal with each other. It looks as if this individual is going to spend a minimum of two years out of work, probably on social assistance before he gets his job back, if ever.

Maybe the Minister of Labour might consider responding to this as well. What can be done when an organization such as the Government of Canada treats its employees with such contempt? It has farmed the whole problem back to the airport manager who says: "I am just going to get rid of the guy. He is on medical leave of absence until he quits". Each time he has come back.

What kind of relief can be obtained for an individual like Joe Davey who has been absolutely shafted by an employer who seems to hold him in complete contempt? He is the victim of nepotism at the local airport level. The top level of the system would just as soon be rid of him because aging employees are not desired in the organization. They have no intent to show this as an example of what good employee-employer relations are. They would rather treat them with contempt.

Are there any suggestions as to what might be done regarding the possibilities or what the Minister of Labour might do to help Joe Davey and others in that spot?

• (1245)

Ms. Langan: Mr. Speaker, I think Joe Davey is the kind of example that this caucus, the New Democrats, tried to address last year when we were addressing the amendments to the Public Service Staff Relations Act.

We were hearing from the government side and the bureaucrats from Treasury Board that the federal government is a very fair, very kind and very caring employer. However there are examples like the one that has just been outlined with regard to Joe Davey, a worker in the last years of his work in the work place who now appears to be finding himself in a situation of being forced off the job and not protected in the long term.

I would suggest to the hon. member who has raised the issue that the first line of defence for Joe Davey is the Public Service Alliance of Canada, his union, and going through the grievance and arbitration process. Failing that I think it would make good sense for the hon. member and myself to document the case and introduce a private member's bill to address this kind of issue. At the same time we can certainly work very hard to make sure that Joe Davey is able to receive a disability pension.

The Minister of Labour is in the House and I am sure he is interested in this kind of case. He is nodding his head so I would assume that he too will take this under advisement to ensure that these kinds of situations do not occur for people who work for the Public Service of Canada.

Mr. Skelly (North Island—Powell River): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask one more question. Another enormous difficulty that Joe Davey faces is that once he is put off on medical leave he winds up having to wait a year for it to go through the process. It is so slow. It is almost deliberately held up.

Of course the Public Service Alliance has dealt with this. It has looked at the human rights commission and a variety of other things. It feels he would actually be successful there, but it will take forever to do. In the meantime he has been seriously harmed. He has children and he has a family to take care of. Enormous damage is inflicted on them.

This is not a matter of disability insurance. This man has been told by his doctors and by specialists in the areas that he can go back to work. The positions that he is entitled to have by seniority and whatnot have been assigned to other people with less skill and less seniority than he has. It almost looks like this is a deliberate attempt to harm his health even further by having him digging in a ditch with a bad back and other problems.

He is entitled to work as a machine operator. Yet the employer has exerted tremendous discrimination. The terrible problem is the extended period of time that they are hung up.

I know the hon. member has worked very hard to try to make the system fair. Hopefully when we send the material over to the Minister of Labour he will take some time to have a look at this very important case as an example of what is happening in the Public Service and in the federal jurisdiction to employees who are under the purview of the minister.

Ms. Langan: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for North Island—Powell River makes a very important point, and that is the length of delay in achieving justice for workers in the public sector. Under the Canada Labour Code the system is enormous, ponderous and slow. It is true that people like Joe Davey end up spending inordinate amounts of time without any income and certainly without any resolution to the case.

I would undertake with the hon. member for North Island—Powell River to pursue this particular case and address the issues so that we can try to ensure that there are not other Joe Daveys throughout the country who have to get justice in the collective bargaining process and legislative process for federal government workers and workers under the Canada Labour Code.

I will pursue this with the hon. member, the Minister of Labour and the President of the Treasury Board.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.

• (1250)

CUSTOMS TARIFF

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C–122, an act to amend the Customs Tariff (textile tariff reduction), as reported (without amendment) from a legislative committee.

Hon. Marcel Danis (for Minister of Finance) moved that the bill be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Danis (for the Minister of Finance) moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Finance and Privatization)): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to speak on third reading of Bill C–122. I shall be brief.

Bill C–122 is important legislation that contains the long awaited textile tariff reductions. The bill will have the effect of amending the Customs Tariff so as to implement, as of January 1, 1993, the textile tariff reductions announced in the government's December 2 economic and fiscal statement.

This is not a new initiative. In 1988 the government announced that it would be reducing Canadian textile tariffs to levels comparable with those of Canada's industrialized trading partners, particularly the United States.

For years Canadian textile tariffs have been significantly higher than those of other industrialized countries. For example, United States textile tariffs are on average one–third lower than Canadian textile tariffs.

These high Canadian textile tariff rates have imposed additional costs on all downstream users of textiles, particularly the apparel and furniture industries. This has affected both the international and domestic competitiveness of our textile–using industries and increased costs to Canadian consumers.

In February 1989 the government asked the Canadian International Trade Tribunal to provide advice on how Canada's textile tariffs could best be brought into line with those of other industrialized nations in order to

maintain the competitiveness of the Canadian apparel industry and other downstream users of textile products.

The Canadian International Trade Tribunal held extensive public hearings on this matter. In 1990 it recommended that Canada's textile tariffs be reduced by moving to a simpler tariff structure involving maximum rates of 5 per cent for fibres, 10 per cent for yarns and 16 per cent for fabrics.

This would reduce Canadian rates from an average of 8 per cent, 13 per cent and 18 per cent to 25 per cent respectively. The tribunal also recommended that tariff rates on certain specially constructed textiles be reduced by one-third.

The tribunal proposed that the textile tariff reduction be phased in over nine years once the results of the Uruguay round of multilateral trade negotiations were known, but not later than 1991.

The recommendations of the Canadian International Trade Tribunal would reduce Canadian textile tariffs by just over one-quarter. This would leave most products with slightly more tariff protection than their United States counterparts and significantly more than those in the European Economic Community or Japan.

The tribunal concluded that its recommendations would generate over-all benefits for the Canadian economy by reducing costs to textile-using industries and consumers. In turn the tribunal concluded that its proposal would have a relatively minor impact on the textile industry and that the industry would successfully adjust to the reductions.

• (1255)

Over the past 20 years the primary textile industry has invested very heavily in its modernization and rationalization. As a result, the industry has recorded impressive productivity gains.

Following receipt of the Canadian International Trade Tribunal's report on textile tariffs the government carefully studied it in detail and concluded that the interests of all parties had been fully considered.

In July 1990 the government expressed its support for the general direction of these proposals. It announced that it would act on the tribunal's recommendations within the framework of decisions to be taken by the Uruguay round of multilateral trade negotiations. Accordingly, with this in mind the textile and apparel industries began to make appropriate adjustments.

It is a little later than 1991 but Bill C-122 contains legislative amendments to implement the tribunal's recommendations effective January 1, 1993. Of course the Uruguay negotiations are still ongoing. It is hoped they will arrive at a conclusion this year, however we had hoped that for the last couple of years and it has not happened. That has nothing to do with the negotiations on textiles but everything to do with the negotiations on agricultural matters.

Bill C-122 is going to implement the tribunal's recommendations with the following modifications. First, to compensate for the delay in its implementation the tariff reductions are being phased out at a rate of 1.5 percentage points annually rather than the 1 percentage point per year that was recommended by the tribunal.

Second, to further simplify the tariff structure all textile fibres, yarns and fabrics are being treated in the same manner. All, excluding speciality fabrics, are being reduced to maximum rates of 5 per cent, 10 per cent and 16 per cent respectively.

Finally, in keeping with our international obligations, margins of tariff preference are being maintained for Australia and New Zealand for six tariff items in which there is significant trade from these countries.

In concluding my remarks I would like to re-emphasize the importance of Bill C-122.

An hon. member: Cheaper suits.

Mr. McDermid: I have my Canadian suit on. It was made in Hamilton by Cambridge. I will give it a little plug today. Wait until you see the tie of my colleague across the way from Eglinton—Lawrence, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. member: Cheaper ties.

Mr. McDermid: It is pretty outstanding too. I am sure it is Canadian made as well.

Reducing textile tariffs is the best way to ensure that Canadian companies such as Cambridge which use substantial qualities of textiles can compete on an equal footing with other companies in the North American market and overseas. It will also ensure that companies are able to market their products at more attractive prices to their customers.

It cannot be forgotten that the health of our textile industry depends to a certain extent upon the strength of its customers. The Canadian apparel industry, its major customer, uses about 35 per cent to 40 per cent of the Canadian textile industry's production.

Nor should we lose sight of the fact that the textile tariff reductions in Bill C–122 will directly benefit many textile producers by reducing their input costs. Bill C–122 represents a fair and reasonable approach to the issue of reducing Canada's textile tariffs.

Delays in introducing the long awaited reduction have created uncertainties for both the textile industry and its customers. It is time to remove any lingering doubts. I respectfully ask that hon. members support speedy passage of this bill through third reading.

Mr. Joseph Volpe (Eglinton—Lawrence): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the plug given to me by my colleague from Brampton. I hope that the lights and cameras can handle the brightness.

Mr. McDermid: It looks like a test pattern.

Mr. Volpe: It is. It is a new product by Canadian manufacturers in the apparel industry and it is a plug for them. They are obviously interested in any kind of legislation and any representation that gives them a competitive edge in a very aggressive business.

• (1300)

The bill is supposed to address the competitiveness of the Canadian apparel industry and its ability to source material so it can provide a product that is attractive from a style point of view and competitive in price.

The committee went through the legislation. It is pro forma legislation. We are talking about reducing tariffs on a list of items. For those of us who want to examine each and every item on an individual basis, there are some five pages of coded documents and coded numbers in three columns per page. For the average citizen to see what exactly is exempt is a bit difficult.

However, we ought to keep a couple of things very much in mind. Some of the suggestions made by the minister opposite we would accept and expect for all Canadians in a competitive environment, in a world environment. The textile industry or the apparel industry in Canada has suffered enormous buffeting over the course of the last several years, in large measure because of increased competitiveness from manufacturers and suppliers overseas, offshore and down south.

The problem has not necessarily been with the tariffs. I recall they were initially put in place to protect nascent and thriving Canadian industries and to give them the added competitive edge required to produce a quality product that would be attractive in its own right. Such attraction would provide Canadians not only with an industry but with an opportunity for employment as well.

Over the course of the last several years the problem the Canadian industry and Canadian manufacturers have experienced has in some measure been due to tariffs. However it has been caused in larger measure by the exchange rate. Today we are addressing legislation that says we are to reduce tariffs at the rate of 1.5 per cent per annum over the course of the next six years, to the point where we will reduce them to zero.

When the minister points to increased productivity on the part of our industry and the increased competitiveness of some of our manufacturers, we are talking about a rather recent situation given that the Canadian dollar has achieved a much more competitive rate overseas.

As a point of criticism, this legislation will encourage Canadian apparel manufacturers to source more and more of their products overseas. In committee we deliberated on this matter to a very thorough extent. The problem we will be facing in Canada is not so much whether we will be talking about whether our tariffs will cause greater strain on some of our producers, whether this is better from a competitive point of view for the consumer, but whether we are addressing an enormous need, a crying need in this country for an industrial strategy that promotes the development of a manufacturing sector.

As I indicated a moment or two ago, this sector has been buffeted and virtually destroyed. The legislation will not do anything to help our textile manufacturers. Granted, it may assist those in the apparel industry inasmuch as the materials they will be using will be available at moderately more attractive rates.

I wanted to give an indication that the Official Opposition is in favour of the reduction of tariffs. Having made extensive efforts to consult with the textile and the apparel industries on this matter, we would have very little objection. Our objection to legislation such as this is that it does not address the large picture.

We would agree that some of the objectives the government outlines in promoting the legislation are laudable and worthy of support. We are sorely lacking in those areas that address a longer term and broader strategic manufacturing strategy. We have not addressed it at all. We are missing another great opportunity to do something for Canadians everywhere. We are missing another opportunity to enhance the manufacturing sector. We are missing a golden opportunity to provide an environment whereby we can create a greater number of jobs.

• (1305)

Mr. Jack Whittaker (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt): Mr. Speaker, I want to put a few remarks on the record. It will not take long.

The bill has to be looked at in the over-all context of what it is doing or what it will continue to do to the textile industry. When we look at the bill, we have to separate the two sections of it dealing with the clothing industry and the textile industry. I believe this particular case is a continuation of what started with the free trade agreement and the dissolution or the erosion of the foundation of the textile industry.

Clothing manufacturers have said that they feel by moving more rapidly than set out in the bill with the breakdown of the tariffs they would be more competitive in the over-all market. Yet on the other hand the textile industry is saying that while it does not necessarily disagree with the tariffs being dropped, it should be phased and loaded in on the other end as opposed to the front end loading of the tariff reduction.

It is interesting to note the employment figures since the free trade agreement was instituted in 1989. Total employment in the Canadian garment industry back in 1988 was 95,800. In 1992 employment had fallen to 62,300. Those are Statistics Canada figures. They are of some concern to our party with respect to the employment aspect.

The minister knows well what has occurred. Often we are hurrying a process. Instead of trying to find a cure for the ills, we are saying let us amputate and see whether we grow back the appendages we have amputated.

Let us look at the over-all manufacturing sector and what has happened to that sector with the realignment through the free trade agreement. We have looked at that amputation as opposed to looking at how we move our industries into a point of international competition so there is the least amount of damage done to the employment base and to families throughout Canada.

I do not think we have looked at that. It is another example of where we have moved the textile industry out. Once again it is often at the expense of women with low end wages, people who have worked hard and do work hard in trying to keep their families together. They are looking at how they are going to get their next dollar. From those Statistics Canada figures we have seen a fairly major drop in employment within the textile industry. That in itself causes a problem within the legislation and causes a problem for the employment base of the textile industry.

We also have to look at the over-all bill itself and exactly what it does. It phases in tariff reductions at the rate of 1.5 per cent per year rather than the recommended 1 per cent in the Canadian International Trade Tribunal recommendations, speeding it up as opposed to back end loading it as requested by the textile industry.

• (1310)

Also, under this bill it would treat specialty textiles and certain lightweight wool fabrics in the same manner as other fibres, yarns and fabrics. That is the tariffs would be reduced a maximum 5 per cent, 10 per cent and 16 per cent respectively. Currently these tariffs are on average 8 per cent, 13 per cent, 18 per cent and 25 per cent respectively. This legislation would maintain the margin of tariff preference for trade with Australia, New Zealand and six tariff items in which there is significant trade.

Clause 1 would implement proposed tariff cuts through an amendment to the Customs Tariff which strikes out a series of existing textile tariffs itemed in schedule I and replaces these with a new set of reduced textile tariffs for goods entitled the most favoured nation and British preferential tariff.

We have to look more broadly at the bill in analysing it and asking where it is leading us and what it is doing. It seems to me that this once again is simply tied in with the

free trade agreement and the North American free trade agreement in pushing to the end where there is the breakdown at the borders between ourselves and the United States.

It gives the advantage, I would suggest, to the United States manufacturers. It is going to cause a problem to some of our clothing manufacturers in bringing out yarns and fabrics that are made offshore and are presently being used. That is because it is going to force them to purchase more North American made fabrics, often made in Mexico or the United States. It is going to put them at a disadvantage in that respect.

From my point of view and from the point of view of my party there are major problems with this in that it does not do what it should do. If there are to be tariffs brought in it seems that they should be back end loaded to ensure the smooth transition for the textile industry.

Mr. McDermid: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member rightfully pointed out that there has been a reduction in employment in the industry.

As I mentioned in my remarks and as the industry itself has acknowledged, rationalization has had to go on. Modern equipment and far more productive operations have come into play. We have seen some very positive results. We have gone through a recession, there is no question about that. We have lost employment to that and we have lost some employment to rationalization.

One of the things I think we should point out to the Canadian public just to make a balanced presentation to them is that exports of apparels are up some 60 per cent since the free trade agreement came in. The Canadian producers of apparel found markets in the United States during the free trade agreement and have done very well with sales. With these changes and reductions in tariffs, it will make them even more competitive. I just wanted to get that on record.

I understand the hon. member's concern about manufacturing jobs and so on and he is right. There has been a reduction, but there has also been an increased productivity, very impressive by the way, in the industry. At the same time, there have been greater exports to the United States which during a recessionary period have been very significant.

Mr. Volpe: Mr. Speaker, I wish I could be as kind as my colleague opposite with respect to the intervention made by the member of the third party.

I cannot because I am a little bit concerned that the member created the impression they had some major difficulties with a piece of legislation on which his party spoke but once at second reading, while we in the Official Opposition kept the debate going for as long as we could in order to get the maximum intervention by the textile industry. When we went into committee, on both occasions that we were there we did not have any representation by members of the third party. If there has been concern we would like to know exactly what it is.

• (1315)

Over the course of the last couple of years, as both the minister and the member from the third party have indicated, there has been an enormous loss of jobs because the industry has suffered an enormous downsizing. We have lost some of the major Canadian textile manufacturers.

That has been a problem for the Canadian industry as a whole. Because of that loss, in order for us to address issues that are now related more to the Canadian apparel industry, this kind of legislation, as incomplete as it would seem to be, at least addresses the component of that general industry that is still thriving, the apparel industry. If we can make its product more competitive, then we should support it.

I think it is important to understand that what we need to do is to ensure that—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): I am sorry to interrupt. The hon. member for North Island—Powell River on a point of order.

Mr. Skelly (North Island—Powell River): Mr. Speaker, 39 Liberals were missing on the NAFTA vote in here and the Liberals voted with the Conservatives to support the NAFTA bill. This is what is actually destroying the tech—

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): I merely want to point out that it is not appropriate to refer to the absence or presence of members in this House or in committee.

Mr. Volpe: Mr. Speaker, you are perfectly right, as always. It is not my intention to refer to the absence or presence of members of any party in this House. It was important to mention in connection with today's debate, aside from any comments about where members happen to be, whether they are Conservatives, Liberals or New Democrats, that my party supports the general concept and underlying principles of this bill. However, there is a problem of which we keep reminding Canadians and that is the lack of an economic strategy addressing all the problems we face as Canadians today. I am referring to the lack of a strategy for creating jobs in industry and the lack of an industrial strategy that supports not just one but all sectors that provide Canadians with opportunities for decent, well-paying jobs, all in the national interest.

[*English*]

Mr. Whittaker: Mr. Speaker, it always gives me a chuckle when I hear Liberals get up and expound on how they care about the economy and point out the failings of other people. We can certainly look to that party and see its failings every time it has been in government, from the massive inflation rates in the early 1980s to the major difficulties that Canadians had as a result of its policies. To listen to that member get up and expound on it and think that he has got the corner on concern for Canadians is really quite laughable.

We agree with this bill. There has to be some more efficiencies and effectiveness within those industries and it must be encouraged. However, one of the difficulties that we in this party have is the attitude of government that you have to amputate in order to move forward. We say that there is a much better way to deal with things, not the Liberal way and not the Conservative way, but the way of the people of Canada to ensure that the jobs are created. I was very pleased to find out from the minister that there are more exports being made and perhaps more jobs for the future.

• (1320)

The fact is that we have hurt the textile industry. We have created unemployment. That is of concern at this particular time to ensure that the people of Canada get out working so that we get off this treadmill of unemployment and welfare payments. This treadmill has led us into this deficit and debt position that is of concern to Canadians. If we have our people working then we have happy Canadians and a healthy economy.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.

* * *

CANADA SHIPPING ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-121, an act to amend the Canada Shipping Act and to amend another act in consequence thereof, as reported (with amendments) by a legislative committee.

Hon. Shirley Martin (for the Minister of Transport) moved that the bill be concurred in.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

Motion agreed to.

Mrs. Martin (for the Minister of Transport) moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, as indicated at second reading we on this side of the House see some merit in this bill. At the same time we see that it has some very serious shortcomings.

I am indebted to my colleague for Ottawa South for the opportunity to investigate this matter in greater depth with him and to express the following reservations on behalf of both of us in our party.

We see improvements in the form of the training of personnel, the reform of navigation practices, surveillance, pilotage practices and in particular in relation to the procedures to be adopted when it comes to the escort of tankers through dangerous passages.

What is missing from this bill is a very important measure that would have gone a long way toward improving the safety and the preventative aspect of tanker travel in future. I am referring in particular to the missing proposal by the Brander–Smith review panel of a $2 per tonne levy that would be used for the construction of double hulls.

This measure would have meant a minimal increase in the already very low price of gasoline at the retail level. It would have been in the range, I am told, of less than .03 cents but it would have allowed the formation of a fund of significance in the years ahead for the construction of tankers equipped with a double hull.

• (1325)

I am told from knowledgeable sources that the increase in the construction of a double hulled vessel would cost only 17 per cent more than the present practice of constructing single hulled vessels.

If we consider for a moment how strong the impact is of a spillage of oil on the environment and on the income of the fishermen and the industry affected, we can realize that a $2 per tonne levy is more than justified. It is a very desirable initiative that one would consider a main feature of this bill and unfortunately it is not contained therein.

Such a fund with a $2 per tonne levy would over 10 years permit reaching a fund of some $800 million. That fund I am told would be a good start toward the renewal of fleets in the future so that they would be equipped with the desired double hull.

In addition to that I am told it would be desirable to make allocations outside the scope of this bill of some $150 million so as to improve the equipment available at present to the Coast Guard. Another $150 million would be required for improving research and development in related fields and another $100 million for the development of an electronic chart that would also enhance the degree of safety in the waters used by oil tankers.

Under the proposed $2 per tonne fund I am told that the shipowners would receive 20 per cent of the cost to build such a double hulled vessel. Recalling my earlier reference to a 17 per cent higher cost for the construction of double hulled tankers we can see that here we have actually a very reasonable arrangement and a very good incentive, if you like, for builders of double hulled vessels to include this additional safety feature.

In investigating this matter and also casting back memories to the hearings of the excellent commission headed by Mr. Brander–Smith, it is important to put on record certain findings. This is namely the desirability of maintaining the inspection of the fleets of non–Canadian owned tankers.

In addition to that it wanted to ensure that all tankers be inspected not just the first time when they enter Canadian waters, as it is the practice right now, but also to continue that practice and not to let it drop to 25 per cent of the fleet as is the practice right now.

• (1330)

In light of these observations we consider this bill only an initial step on the road toward a satisfactory policy of prevention and cure. In the next Parliament we would like to see measures introduced that would strengthen and address specifically every possible preventative initiative.

There is one that we cannot underline enough, although in the process it becomes repetitive, the significance, desirability and urgency of introducing this $2 per tonne levy which this bill does not have but future bills should.

Part of human nature is the tendency to rush to a problem when disaster happens and then gradually lose sight of it and then become somewhat disrespectful in this respect. This is the case of the safety of tankers. The prevention of oil spills is a classic example.

We should not forget the spills that have occurred as a result of the accident of the *Exxon Valdez* as well as those in the Atlantic and in European waters and the like over the last 30 to 40 years.

We have reached such excellent technological levels in aviation that there is no excuse for us not to aim at equally safe and high standards in the field of maritime travel. It is incumbent upon us to do that.

It is obvious that if we proclaim ourselves in support of sustainable development practices that a measure that would introduce double hulls for oil tankers would be an elementary step that really cries for attention. It has already for some time.

I urge the minister in her intervention today to give us an indication as to the intention of the government to pursue the matter of double hulls and the creation of this special fund that would be made possible by the $2 per tonne levy.

In other words, it would be most desirable if the minister could give an indication of how she and her department intend to practice the preaching of sustainable development when it comes to the very practical and daily challenge posed by the oil tankers that travel through Canadian and international waters.

We are very supportive of the excellent final report dated September 1990 by the Public Review Panel on Tanker Safety and Marine Spills Response Capability. It was an excellent effort. We congratulate the government for having launched it but we do not want to go overboard in doing so. It is not feasible from an opposition bench. However we certainly see merits in having done so.

• (1335)

It would have been better perhaps if this bill had seen the light of day sooner. Nevertheless, as I said on other occasions and again at second reading we see this as only half a loaf. It is a measure in the bill that is definitely necessary but it is incomplete, particularly for the reasons I gave in relation to the $2 per tonne levy.

In conclusion I would ask the minister to comment on the important missing aspects of this bill and I thank you for your attention.

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I understand that the minister is not going to speak, which I find unusual, on a piece of legislation that he did not speak on at second reading either.

I think a brief review of the history of the reasons for this legislation is in order. I find it somewhat unusual in my experience here—and this is perhaps the last speech I will give in this place—to not have a government minister or anyone from the government side speak about a piece of legislation that is very important for all coasts of this country. It has implications for the Arctic particularly in terms of an advisory council, but also for the Pacific, Atlantic, Great Lakes and St. Lawrence basin areas.

The last time we had legislation similar to this was following the 1970 *Arrow* disaster. This House finally came forward with the Maritime pollution claims fund three years later. It set up and established a 15 cent per tonne levy on crude oil coming into Canada and on oil shipped within Canadian waters between various locations including to sites in the United States across the Great Lakes.

It was amended in 1989 to become the ship source oil pollution fund which grew to about $200 million, where it stands today. In the last few years that fund has been drilled by the existing Minister of Finance and the $200 million has been taken from the pollution claims fund. Regrettably since 1973 almost no one who has been affected by an oil spill has been able to get any compensation from the fund. It has really been a ridiculous misnomer that there was a claims fund available for dealing with oil pollution damage.

There is a positive aspect of this piece of legislation and those who are interested will find that on page 18 there is a new claims section called clause 710. I will read it into the record because I think it is one of the most important new aspects confirmed by the Coast Guard as to how the public can deal with contamination problems that occur on beaches that are near them on water, fish, boats, nets or whatever.

It is a reverse onus clause which states that the public or those who clean up the spill will be able to submit their actual costs. They will then be paid without having to go to court, making a capital case or coming to Parliament. Then the administrator will collect from the polluter. The polluter will have to pay. It states:

> 710.(1) In addition to any right against the Ship-source Oil Pollution Fund under section 709, a person, other than one described in subparagraphs 677(1)(b)(ii) and (iv), who has suffered loss or damage or incurred costs or expenses referred to in subsection 677(1) in respect of actual or anticipated oil pollution damage may file a claim with the administrator for the loss, damage, costs or expenses.

It is a very important new principle. The point I am making and registering again today as I did at second reading and in committee is that it is regrettable that the Minister of Finance attacked that fund, took out every dollar of the $200 million and spent it on other things.

Now when the administrator needs funds he has to go to the Minister of Finance and Treasury Board and get money from general revenue. That is a much harder process because then the argument will come forward that it is going to mean an increase in the deficit and debt. It is not what Parliament intended and in many countries of the world that kind of pilfering of funds that have been set up and paid for by users simply could not occur.

Like other members I want to thank David Brander-Smith and other members of the panel who were appointed on June 9, 1989 following the *Nestucca* disaster on Vancouver Island and following hard on the heels of the *Exxon Valdez*. I think most people know now that more than $2 billion has been spent trying to clean up the devastation in Prince William Sound and only 8 per cent of the oil from that terrible spill has been cleaned up. Response time and response capacity are important but they have not proven to be terribly successful. Prevention is what all of us have to preach and try to bring about.

• (1340)

The Brander-Smith panel reported on October 24, 1990 and we have waited until today for a response to the 107 recommendations that were made. That is unfortunate. In Latin terminology this bill is *de minimus*. It is as little as the government could possibly do to respond to the really serious risks and dangers we face from oil. Canada is now the largest country in the world. With one of the longest and highest energy coastlines, it is facing a considerable amount of oil spill risk.

The Brander-Smith panel heard 700 groups and witnesses and made a number of very important recommendations. I would like to cover them quickly.

The first one is that there be a $2 per tonne levy. That is one-tenth of one cent per pound or less than one cent per gallon which could have been flowed through to consumers of fossil fuel products in this country. I doubt if one could find a Canadian who would not be prepared to pay less than one cent a gallon more to make sure the highest quality and level of preventive measures and clean-up response were available.

The other two recommendations that Brander-Smith made are also critical to this debate and for Canadians to understand what this legislation is about and why some deficiencies have carried on. One is in terms of double hulling.

I think it is worthy to look at the Canadian tanker fleet of which there are precisely 50. Brander-Smith recommended a seven year phase-in schedule to get rid of all single hulled tankers in the Canadian fleet. This is not an unreasonable period of time and would have provided long-term work for all the shipyards in this country to go the double hulling route.

If the ship source oil pollution fund had stayed in place and started at 15 cents a tonne in 1973, by today it would be just above 35 cents per tonne. The $2 per tonne sounds like an enormous levy but it would have provided $1.5 billion over 10 years for the double hulling costs for the whole of the Canadian fleet, if consumers want that kind of protection.

Brander-Smith discovered while he was undertaking hearings on our behalf that 85 per cent of double hulled tankers world-wide that have been involved in accidents or have grounded have not spilled one drop. The majority of single hulled tankers that are in accidents or groundings do have spills. It is an enormous benefit to double hull ships. As my colleague who spoke a moment ago pointed out, the actual incremental costs to produce double hulls is not that much greater than the production of single hulled tankers.

Let us look at what the schedule of Bill C-121 will mean to Canadians on all of our coasts and Canadians should listen with care. There are 28 tankers under 5,000 tonnes gross. The *C.S. Service* was built in 1923 and will be kept in service until 2015. That tanker will be just shy of 100 years old hauling oil anywhere it pleases in the internal waters of Canada.

It is not alone. The *Genia* was built in 1926.

Mrs. Sparrow: They are inspected every year.

Mr. Fulton: My friend from Alberta says they are inspected every year. The problem is that the statistics speak for themselves. When single hulled tankers run aground there is a spill in 60 per cent of those cases and

in some cases there are very large spills from single hulled tankers.

During committee I proposed a phase-out of those tankers under 5,000 tonnes which will be approaching a century in age by the time they are taken out, the 20 tankers between 5,000 and 15,000 tonnes and the two tankers in excess of 20,000 tonnes.

• (1345)

Regrettably the government voted those amendments down. I used the same schedule as Brander-Smith, a seven-year phase-out so the whole of the Canadian tanker fleet could go to double hulls. I regret to say that the Coast Guard admitted before committee that it never did a single cost profitability study or cost benefit study for any one of the 50 Canadian tankers to see the level of affordability at which they should have gone double hulled, double bottomed, diaphragmed or double walled. There are many techniques to improve safety. The ship owners, in terms of the tanker fleet, want everything from this government. They want no phase-out until 2015 for tankers built in the 1920s which I find absolutely incredible as did Mr. Brander-Smith.

What about response capacity? We always hear the endless call from the government side for the private sector to do everything. In many cases I have no problem with it if it can demonstrate a comparable level of safety and enforcement. But what was found with the *Exxon Valdez* incident in one of the most searching and probing analyses that there has ever been? The study found a level of incestuous activity never before imagined among the U.S. Coast Guard, the enforcement agencies and the private sector responsible for the transportation of oil.

There was no safety equipment. There was no response plan. There was no one in charge. One of the most critical recommendations made during our hearings was to have oversight committees with serious powers to report to the minister and committees of this House. Fortunately the government did bend and we at least now have some powers for the advisory committees.

With regard to response capacity the government regrettably again voted down amendments that would have gotten rid of what I describe as the shadow. It is now three years since Brander-Smith reported to this Parliament. The government has had plenty of time to develop a response scenario. The Coast Guard has $60 million worth of aging oil response capacity in terms of floatable booms, skimmers and so on. It has that equipment. There is a growing level of equipment available to the private sector from on-land response contractors. But as we heard from the Coast Guard, it will take about $100 million for it to step up to the minimal requirements of this legislation which is a 10,000 tonne regional capacity so we will have that on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence basin, the Pacific and the Atlantic. The Coast Guard will maintain responsibility in the Arctic.

Even the proposals in here for the cascading 25,000 tonne capacity so the regional depots must have a back-up transportation regime to get that extra 15,000 tonnes of capacity into place within a certain number of hours and days of a spill is not what Brander-Smith was driving at. Clearly his 107 recommendations were designed to get the best available bang for the buck at the most reasonable cost to the Canadian consumer and ship owners.

When we look at the tonnage of the vessels that have been exempted by this legislation, and I am sincere about this, the very intelligent approach is making the Coast Guard the lead agency. We have to pick somebody and have targets and timetables. David Brander-Smith said if we have a dream and a timetable then we have a plan.

What do we have with this legislation? We have a dream, there is no doubt about that. The Tories are widely known to be dreamers but what about a timetable or targets? For a least the next two years—and I stand to be challenged by anyone in this House because this is what we heard from the Coast Guard—we will have a shadow where there will be inadequate response capacity for spills within the near shore of Canada. This is three years after the report came to this House following the *Exxon Valdez*, the *Braer* accident off the Shetland Islands, the *Kurdistan* and the *Arrow*. What about the *Irving Whale* sitting on the ocean floor in Canada's own maritimes? How can the government just sort of fiddle and fudge its way along? People in this country are prepared to pay. One-tenth of a cent per pound levy? The Tories say: "Oh no, that is too much". Less than a penny a gallon to be passed on so that we can have double hulls and adequate response capability.

• (1350)

Of the three largest recommendations that were made by the Brander–Smith panel this government ducked every single one. While that was going on, the Minister of Finance pilfered the $200 million that was in the emergency response fund. I think the government has a lot to answer for in that field.

The Coast Guard has done some good things during the intervening years. It should be commended, and not only for what it did for us as members of the committee. It did an excellent job in providing us materials we requested. It has also dramatically increased the checking of vessels coming in and out of Canadian waters. It is important to note that our largest crude movements are not in areas where a lot of Canadians might think. In fact Saint John, New Brunswick is the largest with 11 million tonnes, Halifax at 9 million tonnes, Quebec City at 8 million tonnes, and Come–By–Chance at 8 million tonnes.

In previous years we have had a very low level of analysis of those tankers coming into and going out of Canada. The Coast Guard has stepped that up and it is now checking 38 per cent of vessels coming into our waters. Regrettably the level of compliance with recommended steps to repair defects has not been great. I think it is particularly regrettable that almost a quarter of those vessels that are being boarded by the Canadian Coast Guard are found to be defective. That means we have all kinds of time bombs floating off our coast. This legislation will apply to about 10,000 vessels that are defined as ships in the definition section of this piece of legislation.

A fee will be applied to each of them. We heard from witnesses who came before the committee that the fee will be in the neighbourhood of $300 per vessel. Then of course there will be a tariff. Should a vessel be involved in an accident that involves substantial clean–up costs, there will be a tariff applied as well.

We heard a lot from the industry during this whole process. We regrettably did not hear the amount that I think we should have from those who are concerned, what I would describe more broadly in terms of the public interest, particularly environmental organizations. They simply could not afford to attend a lot of the working sessions as Bill C–121 was being developed. That is something that this Parliament cannot continue to allow to occur. We are not like other countries where there is substantial public donation to environmental organizations to attend and participate in legislative functions. In the British parliamentary tradition I think we should be much more alert to providing funds to make sure that those who need to be heard are heard, whether they live on the Great Lakes or the St. Lawrence or in Atlantic Canada, in Pacific Canada or in the Arctic.

This legislation has dire future ramifications. As we know now, the existing tanker fleet will remain *status quo*. The tanker owners want it all. The Minister of Finance took $200 million and ran off with that. We receive no guaranteed provisions until past the turn of the century on double hulling; none. In terms of the response capacity, we have another two year shadow before we are going to have full response capacity up and ready to roll. I think that demonstrates a degree of incompetence and uncaring that is entirely unacceptable.

We heard witnesses last week. As you know, Mr. Speaker, we had a very compressed time schedule. I believe we had second reading debate on May 12. We managed to get all the way through witnesses and the committee process and reporting back to this House in a very short period of time. We did have a witness from the Save Georgia Strait Alliance, a very large alliance representing about 200,000 British Columbians. I suppose the combination of the *Nestucca* which was a tug–barge accident, and the *Exxon Valdez* which was a giant crude carrier has brought us on the Pacific coast to be very alert about how terrifying the impacts of a crude oil spill, particularly in the marine environment, can be.

• (1355)

We should take a look for a moment at the advisory council because it is critical. I think it is from the debate in this House that the Coast Guard should take a good chunk of interpretation of what the amendments to section 660 in fact mean. We made some changes in there that I think are very important. If properly utilized by the ministry of transport and by the commissioner of the Coast Guard it will bring long–term benefits not only to the administration of this piece of legislation but to the prevention of oil spills and the greater protection of our environment.

Those who are interested will find that the amendments in 660 include that the commissioner shall establish at least one advisory council in respect of each geographic area: the Pacific, the Great Lakes, St. Lawrence basin, the Atlantic and the Arctic. There will be seven members on each of these advisory councils.

I am pleased that several of the principles that I moved as amendments were in fact adopted, such as the capacity for the commissioner to pay those who sit on these so that those who give up their time, whether they are a deck hand on a tug or an environmentalist with particular knowledge of some kind of marine life on the back side of Flores Island or whether they have particular knowledge of the breeding capacity and habits of the beluga whales in the St. Lawrence. There are bits and pieces of information that are held by many disparate and separate groups all over this country that will feed best into an advisory council that has some independent spirits. Thankfully one of our amendments allows for those individuals who are appointed to be there on good behaviour.

They are not just there and can be kicked off at the pleasure of the commissioner or the minister. If they have the will to sit on the council they can be paid. They can stand up on their hind legs and tell the media and the public about the ineptitude or inadequacy or incompetence of someone in the government or someone in the private sector who has a responsibility that they are not carrying out to protect us from oil spills.

It is good that the advisory councils have some powers and some teeth, not the least of which was another amendment that I moved that thankfully has been included. That is that the advisory councils can report not only to the commissioner but they can report to the Standing Committee on Transport or the Standing Committee on Environment or to the Minister of Transport. There is a shall clause and that is that they shall get a response back.

One of the things I think a lot of the advisory councils have regretted when they came to particularly tough issues was they reported to the minister or to the House and then nothing ever happened. At least in this case within 30 days or within 14 sitting days of the House there shall be a report.

I see there are only a couple of minutes until Question Period time, so let me just give a bit of a summation and I will carry on after Question Period.

We have a tendency to respond following crises. Following the 1970 sinking of the *Arrow* we passed legislation in 1973. Since the *Exxon Valdez* and the *Nestucca* we have had almost four years waiting time while the government has prepared Bill C–121. It has obvious inadequacies. Just as I say to the Coast Guard: "You are going to have to be very firm and very vigilant with this private sector concept". I also say to the ship owners, all 10,000 of whom will come under the rubric of this legislation, that: "You had better make sure that the response capability and capacity that your onshore contractor has is in fact state of the art, is in fact the best available technology".

Mr. Brander–Smith discovered that the Coast Guard was totally inadequately prepared when he was appointed in 1990 and it has admitted that it is still totally inadequately prepared now.

As a nation we stand without private sector response that is adequate, without Coast Guard response that is adequate and a piece of legislation where, because the government would not buy into a statutory requirement that I moved to make sure that the 10,000 tonne capacity and the 25,000 tonne capacity were in place by next January, there is an unknown period of time within which we will not have adequate response capacity.

Therefore there are tankers that could be dangerous out there and we have an inadequate capability to deal with them and with others should an accident regrettably occur.

I look forward to continuing following Question Period.

Madam Deputy Speaker: It being 2 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 30(5), the House will now proceed to statements by members pursuant to Standing Order 31.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 31

[*Translation*]

FIGHT AGAINST AIDS

Mr. Guy Saint–Julien (Abitibi): Madam Speaker, contrary to the allegations made by Jean–Luc Mongrain during the *Opération Enfants–Soleil* telethon on TVA yesterday that the federal government has done nothing for AIDS victims, we have played a leading role in the fight against AIDS. Our goal is to prevent transmission of the HIV virus and provide the necessary support for

people who are HIV-positive, their families and care givers.

In 1986 we launched a five-year, $39 million initiative to fight AIDS. In 1988 we invested an additional $129 million, also spread over five years. In 1989 we paid out $120,000 in compensation to every person who contracted the AIDS virus through blood transfusions. In 1991 the Federal Centre for AIDS designed a quick and inexpensive way to detect HIV in babies of infected mothers. This test will improve the chances of survival of newborn infants.

May Jean-Luc Mongrain be forgiven for what he said.

* * *

[*English*]

EARTH SUMMIT

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Madam Speaker, this week we celebrate the anniversary of the earth summit held in Rio de Janeiro. The earth summit produced a number of agreements on the environment and development so as to achieve development that can be sustained without harming the environment.

However, no hard commitments were made at the earth summit in Rio. In the words of Dr. Jim MacNeill: "Our leaders left almost nothing unsaid and almost everything undone". The Government of Canada signed the climate convention yet it still has no plans on how to stabilize greenhouse gas emissions.

The government signed a bio-diversity convention. Yet not a word has been said about clear cutting Clayoquot Sound. The government promised in agenda 21 to increase foreign aid to developing countries but instead it has cut aid.

This government makes big promises abroad but lacks the political will to keep them at home. What a sham.

CANADIAN HIGHWAYS

Mr. J. W. Bud Bird (Fredericton—York—Sunbury): Madam Speaker, it has been revealed that almost 40 per cent of Canada's national highway system is currently below minimum standards and almost 25 per cent of the bridges on that system are in major need of repair.

The total estimated cost to put all of Canada's national highway system in good shape is more than $14 billion. To its credit the government has made a small start through the strategic capital investment initiative, through which about $500 million will be spent over the next five years. However our highway system desperately needs more than that. It is rapidly becoming a national emergency.

I urge the federal-provincial ministers of finance and transportation to target the highway system as the first priority in their new approach to collaborative planning and budgeting. Major infrastructure investments must not be deferred indefinitely. Perhaps highway construction offers the best potential of all to stimulate economic growth and employment and to reduce government costs for unemployment and welfare.

* * *

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

Mr. Réginald Bélair (Cochrane—Superior): Madam Speaker, last week mayors, citizens and myself strongly argued against the CNR's intention to cancel the Northlander train from North Bay to Toronto.

We have emphatically pointed out that the CNR should not victimize the citizens of northern Ontario by cutting off a transportation service that was affordable to seniors, students, the handicapped and those who have to travel to Toronto for specialized medical attention.

The northern travel grant covers only one-half of their travel costs which are prohibitive to most. While bus transportation is available it is most uncomfortable during the 15 hours it takes to get to Toronto.

The CNR's mandate is to ensure isolated regions of this country are linked to urban centres where special-

ized services are offered. The need to subsidize the Northlander run will always exist and senior governments have the moral obligation to continue this vital rail transportation service for us.

* * *

FOSSIL CENTRE

Mr. Bill Casey (Cumberland—Colchester): Madam Speaker, along the shoreline near Joggins, Nova Scotia, a small community in my riding located at the head of the Bay of Fundy, there are high cliffs which are continually washing away. As the cliffs wash away a treasure in fossils is being released. For decades one man has been there collecting this scarce evidence of our past. That man is Mr. Don Reid.

This weekend he opened the new fossil centre in Joggins where he will share one of the most unique collections of fossils in the world with people from all over the world. The centre was built through the co-operative efforts of the community, the province and the federal government and, of course, Mr. Don Reid. The committee in charge of the project was successfully led by John Reid from Joggins.

• (1405)

I congratulate Don, John and the community for their involvement in the Joggins fossil centre. If anyone wants to see Don he will still be down showing others where the fossils are and explaining exactly what they mean.

* * *

ORGAN DONATION

Mr. Steve Butland (Sault Ste. Marie): Madam Speaker, the issue of organ donation is obviously one of life and death. We should all do what we can to make people aware of the urgency of considering signing an organ donor card and of discussing this most sensitive issue with their family.

As Dr. Calvin Stiller from University Hospital in London, Ontario has said:

> For an individual dying because a donor is not available, it is the cruelest of lotteries; the sicker you get, the closer to the front of the waiting list you get, but also the likelier you are to die before the door of a transplant opens for you.

There are over 4,000 transplants performed each year in Canada. The success rate is 80 per cent for kidney and heart transplants, 70 per cent for liver transplants and 90 per cent for corneal transplants.

These operations are no longer experimental but there must be guidelines in place. I encourage the federal government to respond to the eight recommendations made by the Law Reform Commission of Canada, one of which proposes a criminal code for the sale of human organs.

I encourage all MPs to join the member for Crowfoot and the member for London East in support of this important initiative.

* * *

WESTERN GRAIN TRANSPORTATION ACT

Mr. Ken Atkinson (St. Catharines): Madam Speaker, I welcome the announcement on Friday that the Western Grain Transportation Act is to be reformed.

From a transportation viewpoint the change will result in a more efficient and cost effective system. I am pleased that the government has recognized the directional bias that this act creates against the St. Lawrence seaway and that steps will be taken to deal with the problem.

However as the reforms are to be phased in over a period of time it will be necessary to provide interim relief to the seaway in order to ensure that there will be ships available at the end of this process.

I would urge the government to adopt the subcommittee's recommendations to freeze tolls and pilotage fees on the seaway until the reforms are completed in order that the viability of the seaway may be maintained.

* * *

POVERTY

Mrs. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West): Madam Speaker, the chair of the poverty committee has received an invitation to do lunch with an advocate for the disabled and disadvantaged who live in my constituency of Ottawa West.

Ms. Karen Tracey suggests that the member for Don Valley North has a lot to learn about poverty and the need for food banks and that her ignorance might best be corrected by a period of community service at a food bank as a suitable penalty for sending her staff to rip off food intended for the poor.

As an unfunded, unpaid advocate living on disability benefits Ms. Tracey may not be able to entertain the member from Don Valley in the member's usual style. However if she is truly interested in enlightening her views on poverty she will accept the invitation to join Ms. Tracey for her lunch at her usual place, her neighbourhood soup kitchen.

I urge the member to accept this most gracious offer and open her eyes before she opens her mouth again.

* * *

HOUSING

Hon. Alan Redway (Don Valley East): Madam Speaker, in February 1992 the government introduced two new housing programs, the 5 per cent down payment and the RRSP down payment. Both were aimed at allowing first-time home buyers to purchase a home while at the same time stimulating our sluggish economy.

Since then some 95,500 mortgages have been insured under the 5 per cent down payment plan allowing first-time home buyers to purchase homes costing over $9 billion.

Over the same period 148,000 Canadians withdrew almost $1.5 billion from their Registered Retirement Savings Plans to use for home down payments.

Our economic recovery still has a long ways to go. However imagine what the job picture would have been like during the past year and a half without the spending stimulus provided by these two housing programs.

* * *

HEALTH

Mr. Jim Karpoff (Surrey North): Madam Speaker, in June 1992 the Subcommittee on Health Issues published a unanimous report outlining the growing concerns about foetal alcohol syndrome and foetal alcohol effect.

One of the recommendations made was that the federal government initiate a national program requiring warning labels on all alcoholic beverages setting out the danger of drinking during pregnancy.

At the time the minister of health stated that the government would at least initiate a pilot project. A year has passed and the government has done nothing except cave into the pressure of the brewery and distillery industry.

Has the minister of health now changed his mind? Does he no longer support warning labels? I call on the minister of health to stand up for children and women and stand up to the alcohol lobbyists and initiate a health warning program on alcoholic beverages.

* * *

• (1410)

AIRLINE INDUSTRY

Mr. Scott Thorkelson (Edmonton—Strathcona): Madam Speaker, Air Canada is planning to appeal the decision of the National Transportation Agency to allow AMR Corp. to purchase a portion of Canadian Airlines.

Air Canada has said it believes Canada should have a single airline. Canadians want choice in air travel. They want the Canadian airline industry to be competitive. They want to receive the best possible service at the best possible price.

The federal government must maintain and encourage competition in our airline industry. The government should allow this foreign investment in a Canadian airline. This would provide Canadian airlines with greater access to capital.

This deal would keep thousands of Canadian jobs and would provide Canadian Airlines with the means to be more competitive in our airline industry.

This is in the best interest of Canadians.

* * *

PAUL EDWARDS

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, congratulations to Mr. Paul Edwards, the newly elected leader of the Liberal Party of Manitoba.

The son of a minister, raised in small prairie towns for most of his life, Mr. Edwards was elected by universal suffrage of party members by which five times more people were involved than would have been the case if we had used the traditional method.

Mr. Edwards and his team will now set about identifying the issues of most critical concern to Manitobans and offer creative solutions.

Paul Edwards shows much promise and he will get a chance to show Manitobans his leadership ability in the next provincial election expected within a year or a year and a half.

Bravo as well to Kevin Lamoureux for having fought such an excellent campaign. He did a superb piece of work.

[*Translation*]

All Manitobans are winners in this leadership race.

* * *

[*English*]

HEALTH CARE

Mr. Bob Corbett (Fundy—Royal): Madam Speaker, health care should be a grave concern to us all yet the New Brunswick McKenna Liberal government has turned its back on Saint John in a crass political move by yanking 103 beds out of the Saint John Regional Hospital hard on the heels of the destruction of St. Joseph's Hospital. Two hundred and fifty jobs will be lost in the process.

The premier then stood shoulder to shoulder with the Liberal candidate in Fundy—Royal proclaiming their good deeds, urging people to vote for a Chrétien-led Liberal government so that they can work together for the people of New Brunswick.

The people of Fundy—Royal and Saint John are experiencing firsthand what Liberal governments do, not for them but to them. St. Joseph's Hospital stands as a pitiful testimony to what Liberal governments are all about.

* * *

NORTH AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. Lyle Vanclief (Prince Edward—Hastings): Madam Speaker, the United States is seeking side deals in the North American free trade negotiations to protect against import surges for fruit and vegetable products. This government, if it insists on forcing this agreement on Canadian producers, should do the same for Canadians.

Under a system proposed by grower associations in the United States a price threshold should be set and tariffs would be restored when prices fall below that set level. This would be recorded by a monitoring agent.

Presently, under the free trade agreement the snapback provision is ineffective as it is based on volumes and comes into effect after the damage is done.

Canada must protect its food and industry from import surges which will arise as a result of the NAFTA. Canada should insist upon and endorse a price-triggered snapback to prevent harmful surges of imports.

* * *

DISABILITY PENSIONS

Mr. Greg Thompson (Carleton—Charlotte): Madam Speaker, the process of application for a disability pension with the Department of National Health and Welfare should be reviewed.

The process as it now exists is lengthy and cumbersome. Virtually all initial applications are rejected. As a result the applicants step through a process which can take a year or longer to complete.

It is imperative that the government find the funding required to expedite the backlog of appeals. Reviews of appeals must be done in a much shorter time period. Many disabled people have absolutely no income while waiting for these decisions and a year is simply much too long to make them wait.

Let us find a way to speed up the process and improve the application process as well.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Vic Althouse (Mackenzie): Madam Speaker, Tory ministers from this dying government make last minute announcements to farm policy which they hope will be irreversible and then they quit.

Hamstringing the Canadian Wheat Board in marketing barley is one case. Finishing the job of killing the Crow rate is another. Granted the Liberals began the attack on prairie farm communities when Otto Lang first took feed grains away from the wheat board to give processors cheaper grain. Otto also began killing the Crow rate but was stopped by his electorate. Liberals

Pépin and Axworthy were not able to finish the job. Now the Conservatives are doing it for them.

• (1415)

They say they are addressing new realities. The reality is that time and history have not made prairie farmers closer to tide water. Time and history have brought fewer not more international grain traders and a stronger wheat board and Crow rate are still necessary in today's international reality.

Neither Liberal nor Conservative ideologies see this reality and they have become irrelevant themselves.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

INFRASTRUCTURE

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Speaker, I have a question for the Acting Prime Minister.

Today Transport Canada reported that 40 per cent of Canadian highways need work. If cabinet members were not always flying in aeroplanes looking down at the roads instead of travelling by bus throughout Canada as I have been doing for the last two and a half months, they would realize that Transport Canada is right.

At this moment the municipalities and the provincial governments are asking the federal government to participate in an infrastructure program because it is the best time for it. There is a lot of manpower available and contracts can be obtained quite cheaply in relation to other times.

Will this government consider the reality and decide to invest in the infrastructure of the nation at this time?

Hon. Shirley Martin (Minister of State (Transport)): Indeed, Madam Speaker, there are others than the hon. member who travel the highways in our country. We have been working with our provincial counterparts—

Ms. Copps: When was the last time you were at Hamilton airport, Shirley?

Mrs. Martin: A week ago, Sheila.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Getting to the first question and the first answer, I would like to hear the answer.

Mrs. Martin: Madam Speaker, we have been working with our provincial counterparts as of course this House knows that highways other than the Trans-Canada Highway are a provincial responsibility. Even though that is so we have been working with them. We have over the last three months announced a total of $200 million in the east and west and also another $40 million for the Alaskan Highway and another $50 million for the Trans-Canada Highway in Alberta.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Speaker, the trouble with the minister's remarks is that these expenditures were planned long ago and have no connection with the current economic situation. What we are suggesting is a three-level program, in other words, one-third funded by the municipalities, one-third by the provincial government and the remaining one-third by the federal government.

We were in the Montreal area not long ago, which is certainly one area where the infrastructure needs improving, and where there are serious problems. Other lands of government are asking the federal government to start a program now, while there is a labour surplus. I would like to hear from the minister how much the government is prepared to invest in the Montreal area, at a time when unemployment has reached incredible levels and Montreal is referred to as the poverty capital of Canada.

[*English*]

Hon. Shirley Martin (Minister of State (Transport)): Madam Speaker, moneys have already been set aside for bridge repairs in the Montreal area. This is not old money but rather new money under the Strategic Capital Investment Initiative that was announced by my colleague the Minister of Finance.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Speaker, the member for Beauséjour is from New Brunswick.

[*English*]

According to today's report by Transport Canada, New Brunswick is the worst place in the country where investment in the infrastructure is needed and in particular in the highways where during the summer many

people lose their lives on the terrible highways. There is virtually no Trans-Canada Highway at all.

Why did this government make commitments to New Brunswick some months ago and now it is negating its word with Premier McKenna?

Hon. Shirley Martin (Minister of State (Transport)): Madam Speaker, we are not negating our word with Premier McKenna.

• (1420)

Mr. Joe Fontana (London East): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance or the Acting Prime Minister.

Each time the provinces, municipalities and this Liberal Party have promoted an infrastructure program the Minister of Finance has complained of fiscally irresponsible spending. The recent Transport Canada documents indicate that this government has been the culprit and has been fiscally irresponsible by ignoring Canada's crumbling roads and bridges, leaving an even larger bill for someone to pay in the years ahead.

I want to ask the Minister of Finance how he could have been so fiscally irresponsible. Will he now work co-operatively with the provinces and the municipalities to put people back to work and put our infrastructure on a sound, competitive foundation?

Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Finance and Privatization)): Madam Speaker, the Minister of Finance has been very, very responsible in his presentation of financial statements and budgets over the past couple of years and in fact brought forward an infrastructure program to deal with our national transit system.

It was a modest program. The Minister of Finance has said that many times as others in our caucus have said. It is a modest program, but it is one that the government felt it could afford in the times that we are in.

The hon. member stands up and says that we should be throwing $14 billion, or whatever it is, at a highway program. What he fails to say to the people of Canada is where the money is coming from. He knows it will come from two places: either we borrow it or we raise taxes.

Mr. Kilgour: Helicopters.

Mr. McDermid: Well, here is the opposition. Their answer to every financial problem in the country is helicopters. That is rather interesting. That is their answer to every financial question. What they do not talk about are the 42,000 jobs that the helicopter program is producing in this country. They forget that and they do not tell that to the people of Canada.

Mr. Joe Fontana (London East): Madam Speaker, modest is not the word. Insignificant is the word.

This government's lack of plans for infrastructure is irresponsible and the transport document indicates that. This government claims to have a strategy for Canada's economic growth and prosperity but its policies are all smoke and mirrors just like we have heard from the minister again.

Canada invests about $53,000 per kilometre on highway infrastructure compared to $352,000 for the United States, $504,000 for Italy and $237,000 for France.

If Canada's global competitiveness is a priority of this government, why has it deliberately ignored the diminishing quality of our transportation system compared to other countries? Why will this government not invest in Canada to ready this country for the 21st century?

Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Finance and Privatization)): Madam Speaker, I have a couple of comments I might make on the hon. member's statement.

Only a Liberal would say that half a billion dollars is insignificant. It is a tremendous amount of money and it comes from the taxpayers of this country.

Second, he compares the expenditures on highways to the United States and to Italy. First of all the United States does its highways in a different manner than we do. It is responsible for more of the interstates than we are in this country, as the hon. member knows. There are toll roads in the United States. Is he advocating that? We do not know if the Liberal Party would do that or not.

Italy is responsible for the roads. It does not have provincial governments that are responsible for roads like we have in this country. He is comparing apples and oranges.

The Minister of Finance has brought forward a responsible program to help with infrastructure and certain parts of the Trans-Canada Highway which I think is very responsible, at the same time keeping in mind the fiscal responsibilities that any government in this country has.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Employment and Immigration.

Last Friday the Minister of State for Employment repeated the various tired responses that we have heard from this government in response to Canada's job crisis. I say to the minister that it is true that unemployment claims are down from 1992 but that is because one million Canadians exhausted their benefits under unemployment insurance, putting almost three million Canadians total on welfare in various provinces and territories.

I would say also to the minister that the government's unemployment rate is very high, up to 11.4 per cent officially, but much higher as we all know in various regions of this country. It is almost close to double that of the United States, our main trading partner.

• (1425)

I ask the minister, on behalf of his government, when this government is going to seriously address the jobs crisis in this country. While this government has been obsessed with one job, the leadership of its party, it has ignored the millions of unemployed Canadians.

I ask the minister when this government is going to have a real jobs plan for Canadians and not just one member of his government.

Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is asking what is being done to create jobs. A low interest rate and low inflation are required by the private sector to invest and to create jobs. This is the recipe the government is pursuing.

The hon. member asked what we are doing. In the 1990s the New Democrats should realize that in this information age, with the skills required for the new jobs that this economy is creating, we have to invest in the skills of people.

Notwithstanding the objection and the steadfast refusal of her party, we have decided to activate the passive use of UI funds so that this year $3.8 billion will be invested in the skills of Canadian workers. This is the way we can create a climate that will encourage investment and get people working. It is working and there are good signs things will be improving.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon): Madam Speaker, the minister said there were some good signs, but only a few, because the number of full-time jobs has been reduced by 78,000, the number of jobs in the manufacturing sector by 37,000, and among young people 23,000 jobs have been lost. This is a tragedy. When will the minister and this government do something about this human tragedy?

Hon. Bernard Valcourt (minister of Employment and Immigration): Madam Speaker, once again one can get upset about statistics and prefer to remain oblivious to the facts. If we look at the indicators that give Canadians some idea of what is happening in our economy, we realize for instance that the Canadian economy has improved in March, which shows the highest monthly growth rate in two years.

At that time there was a recession not just in Canada but also in other countries, and especially in the United States where there was a tremendous economic slowdown, but we managed to increase our exports to that country at a rate unheard of in Canada's history. And exports, the Leader of the New Democratic Party will agree, create jobs in Canada. We are on the right track, we are on course and we will create jobs by encouraging investment in our economy not with make-work projects that are very expensive to run and do not help anyone.

[*English*]

Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon): Madam Speaker, my supplementary question is for the minister.

It sure is time for this government to go when all we hear from this government is "don't worry, be happy", ignoring the fact that this government leaves the highest

number of unemployed Canadians ever in the history of Canada. The minister refuses to look at this issue.

In this same area the Canadian Labour Congress released a study this week revealing the following effects of the recession for women in the labour force. The 25-year trend of increased participation of women in the labour force has been reversed. In fact more women have been pushed into part-time jobs not full-time jobs. One in five women is either underemployed or without employment.

One leadership candidate in the Tory party talks about the politics of inclusion but never about jobs. It would be real inclusion if that leadership candidate did that. I ask the minister again, does the government have a plan or is it content to see Canada remain as 11th in the world in quality of life for women?

Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Madam Speaker, again the hon. member stands up and provides Canadians with a great example of the Canadian Labour Congress and NDP policies.

• (1430)

When the government introduced the prosperity initiative it asked the stakeholders in the private sector, in the educational world and at the provincial level to get together to map out a plan for the future recovery of our economy and the prosperity of the country.

What did they do? The NDP and the Canadian Labour Congress are interested too much in partisan politics to sit down at a table and work constructively to try to find solutions. We invited them to participate and they refused.

Notwithstanding, we have an action plan that is in place which the federal government has answered. We hope the private sector will do its share also.

Mr. Maurizio Bevilacqua (York North): Madam Speaker, my question is for the minister of employment.

Many economists have expressed serious disappointment with the unemployment statistics released last week. The rate of 11.4 per cent is the same as the rate last month. The loss of 78,000 full-time jobs has stopped the recovery dead in its tracks.

Given the fact that every important forecasting body is predicting continued high unemployment in Canada and everyone agrees that high unemployment is hurting the recovery, when will the government stop ignoring the unemployment crisis and introduce effective programs to put Canadians back to work?

Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Madam Speaker, the hon. member tells me that 11.4 per cent unemployment is too high a number. My government, my colleagues in caucus and in cabinet and I—everyone—totally agrees. The question is what we are going to do about it.

The Liberals are asking us to throw money at the problem. They want us to increase the deficit or to tax Canadian taxpayers more in order to throw more money at the problem.

We are arguing that the fundamentals have to be for jobs to be created, and they are. He points to statistics. What about the OECD report on all industrialized countries in the world? They predict that Canada will have the largest growth of any industrialized nation in the world this year and next year.

These are good signs that the economy is picking up and that jobs will be created. However for this to happen we need a skilled work force. That is why, notwithstanding the objection of the Liberal Party of Canada, we are investing this year $3.8 billion, the federal share, in skills development in Canada.

Mr. Maurizio Bevilacqua (York North): Madam Speaker, the minister cannot be serious. The fact is that Canada has the worst unemployment rate of all G-7 nations. While our most important trading partner, the United States of America, has just posted an unemployment rate of 6.9 per cent, a one and a half year low, our economy has stalled.

When will the government change its course and introduce specific programs so the 89,000 unemployed Canadians in Vancouver, the 216,000 unemployed Canadians in Toronto and the 221,000 unemployed Canadians in Montreal can get back to work?

Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Madam Speaker, for jobs to be created in this global economy we have to get investment in the private sector and people to create jobs in the private

sector. For this to happen we need lower interest rates, low inflation and access to markets. These are exactly the policies the government is pursuing.

The number of UI recipients in March was down 2.5 per cent from February and 5.7 per cent from a year earlier. To anyone who is not a Liberal, a partisan Grit who is only interested in tiny politics, this is a positive sign that things are picking up and jobs are being created. Maybe it is not at the rate we would like, but we have to stay the course in order to create those jobs so Canadians can get back to work.

* * *

• (1435)

SOCIAL PROGRAMS

Ms. Albina Guarnieri (Mississauga East): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

Today the Caledon Institute is warning Canadians that the continuing growth of low wage jobs will keep many workers far below the poverty line and guarantee an increasing number of impoverished seniors in this Tory stricken economy. Just last week we were told by the Carleton University that this government was on course to Americanize key elements of social policy.

Could the minister explain why his government seeks to rule a country with Mexican wages and American social programs?

Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Madam Speaker, I believe Canadians will determine in all their wisdom if they believe that Canada has the same wages as Mexico. I just very quickly ask Canadians to understand the seriousness of this question. I would appreciate a good question and it would be a good question if she were not trying to distort the reality of this country.

We know very well and agree that Canadians have faced difficult periods in terms of the economy and in terms of the maintenance of social policies. We have kept the social policies, unlike this report is saying, in terms of the increase in spending for the annual growth of social policies in Canada.

Once again I am ready to answer any question which is not like the question raised by the member about the comparison between the wages of Mexico and Canada. However tomorrow they will have a question on why we want to take Canadian wages to the level of those of Mexico.

Ms. Albina Guarnieri (Mississauga East): Madam Speaker, the government will soon get a new chief fiddler but it will still be ragtime for Canadian workers.

[*Translation*]

My supplementary question is directed to the same minister. Today, the Caledon Institute on Social Policy released a study indicating that the number of people who will be able to count on social security benefits when they reach retirement age is decreasing steadily. Members of the baby boomer generation who expect to have an annual income of more than $23,000 upon retirement will notice this, as the government claws back their Old Age Security pension.

Could the minister explain why he plans to use the pension funds of Canadians to pay for the administrative incompetence of his own government?

Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Madam Speaker, once again it would be easy to show how far off the mark the comparisons the hon. member made today, and regularly makes in the House, with reference to individual situations, really are. I will try to answer the question about the problem of poverty and maintaining social programs. It is a serious question.

The pension plan is administered jointly by the federal and provincial governments. The hon. member's comment that baby boomers will not be in a position to benefit is incorrect. The plan is reviewed regularly by the provinces and the federal government, and the rates are adjusted on the basis of actuarial projections for the next 15, 20 or 25 years. This was done last year and it is being done on a regular basis.

I would therefore advise the hon. member to listen carefully and take a good look at what we have done so far before asking questions that do nothing to solve the problems Canadians would like to see solved.

[*English*]

Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing): Madam Speaker, my question is also for the Minister of National Health and Welfare and relates to the same study.

Today one of Canada's leading social policy analysts and former chair of the government's own advisory body, the National Council of Welfare, released a report condemning the federal government for its slash and

burn approach to social programs and "for its economic policies which fuel mass unemployment".

Professor Battle pointed out that most social policy changes were effected through what he called social policy by stealth: the introduction of complex technical amendments to taxes and social programs that deliberately camouflage their intent, extent and impact.

Why is this government being so sleazy in cutting services to the poorest of our society in such an underhanded way?

• (1440)

Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Madam Speaker, I repeat what I said to the Liberal member. The hon. member is wrong because we have not cut. Actually we have increased by 3.6 per cent total federal program spending. Since 1984–85 the gross domestic product has increased from 2.6 per cent to 14.4 per cent.

Obviously we do not have the capacity the NDP has, but we do not have the same decisions it has to make in Ontario today.

Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing): Madam Speaker, I am glad the minister related this to choices because this is an issue about choices.

The report also stated that the continuation of Liberal tax breaks for the rich and for profitable corporations by the Tories who have the same friends amounted to over $17.5 billion in 1989 or 65 per cent of the deficit that year. The provinces lost another $9 billion in revenues. At the same time Canada's poor and middle class were paying more taxes and seeing their social programs slashed.

Why is the government continuing with massive tax giveaways to its rich and big business friends, making lower income Canadians pay more taxes and at the same time developing policies which as Professor Battle says create mass unemployment?

Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Madam Speaker, I do not know if we still have friends in big business, but I know the NDP does not have any friends in unions any more from what I see in Ontario and in other provinces.

Second, I should point out to my hon. friend what the report says. It says that the new child tax benefit gives a welcome $500 a year increase to working families. This same report says that the introduction of the GST credit was a positive move. It says that government spending on training has tripled investment since 1984.

We can read what we want in the report. I am repeating what I said before. The Government of Canada since 1984 has increased the amount of money put in social programs. At the same time it had to manage an economy which was left in a sad state by the Liberal Party in 1984.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

Mr. John Harvard (Winnipeg—St. James): Madam Speaker, my question is for the minister speaking for agriculture today.

The Canadian farming community was left reeling by last week's announcements by the Minister of Agriculture. Farmers have made it clear they want no part of a continental barley market, yet the government has gone ahead with it.

In the case of removing the interest-free portion of the cash advance program there appears to have been no consultation. There is no question that this will add to the heavy burden carried by farmers.

Why did the government do away with the interest-free portion of the cash advance program?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Blais (Minister of Justice, Attorney General of Canada and Minister of State (Agriculture)): Madam Speaker, this program which the government has maintained for many years is still in effect. To answer the hon. member's question, the program is being maintained, but we are going to share the cost of interest payments with producers. In their case the rate will never be more than 4 per cent.

If we look at current interest rates, farmers who must take out substantial loans are certainly one segment of the population that over the years benefited from low interest rates. The hon. member will agree there is no comparison with the 21 per cent and 22 per cent we had when the Liberals were in power.

[*English*]

Mr. John Harvard (Winnipeg—St. James): Madam Speaker, the minister should know that the interest-free cash advance program has been an important management and marketing tool. A number of respected farm groups has already indicated concern and displeasure over the removal of the interest-free portion of the program including the Ontario Corn Producers' Association, the Manitoba Corn Growers Association and Keystone Agricultural Producers that say this is the government's way of off-loading costs on to the backs of farmers.

Why did the government move ahead on this matter without any support whatsoever from farmers? It did not have any.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Blais (Minister of Justice, Attorney General of Canada and Minister of State (Agriculture)): Madam Speaker, regarding the first question, I have already said the government faces a rather problematic financial situation. The fact that we maintained this program, with a few changes, will still put several million dollars in the pockets of farmers to help support their operations at rates that are now the lowest—correct me if I am wrong—we have seen in 30 years.

I think this government's efforts to keep interest rates as low as possible have been outstanding. I think that at the end of the day farmers will understand and recognize this.

* * *

• (1445)

[*English*]

WESTRAY MINE DISASTER

Mr. David Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond): Madam Speaker, my question is for the minister of small business and concerns the lack of compensation for the families of the victims of the Westray mine disaster.

It is my understanding that the Government of Canada has now been awarded $13.6 million as its share of the insurance settlement negotiated earlier with Curragh Resources.

Can the minister inform the House whether it is the intention of the government to provide a compensation package to the widows and family members of the deceased miners?

Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister for Science and Minister of State (Small Businesses and Tourism)): Madam Speaker, the hon. member knows this money is part of the insurance proceeds which the federal government received as a result of this tragedy.

The money is in the Consolidated Revenue Fund. Members of this House can speak in Parliament and raise ideas about how the money should be spent.

The hon. member raises an interesting suggestion but he must know that responsibility for this should be shared broadly and not just by the federal government which did its bit by giving a loan to make the project which would create 200 or 300 jobs in Pictou county possible.

Mr. David Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond): Madam Speaker, I take it from the minister's intervention that the government is not contemplating a compensation package for the families and widows of the deceased miners.

I want to inform the minister that it was the Government of Canada that provided an $85 million loan to the Bank of Nova Scotia, the guarantor for Curragh Resources. Curragh Resources has now picked up another $2.4 million in insurance money.

I want to ask the minister this. In the spirit of fairness will he now put in motion a process whereby the government, in conjunction with the Government of Nova Scotia, will provide some form of compensation to the widows and families of the deceased miners, as well as providing additional money to assist in economic development in Pictou county?

Can the minister give us that guarantee? Will he give it to us today?

Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister for Science and Minister of State (Small Businesses and Tourism)): Madam Speaker, I remember when the government, after a great deal of study and considerable energetic criticism from the hon. member opposite on behalf of Devco and Cape Breton, opposed the notion of having a mine at all in Pictou county.

The government took the position that it wanted to see a regional development program in Pictou county. This particular opportunity presented itself. The hon. member fought that suggestion every inch of the way. He wanted coal mining only in Devco, only in Cape Breton.

Unfortunately this regional development project came to a tragic end.

The hon. member makes some representations. Of course the government will accept those representations and look at them. He should remember that he fought regional development in Pictou county from beginning to end.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Vic Althouse (Mackenzie): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to whoever is speaking on behalf of grain marketing and transportation issues today.

I was sent to Ottawa years ago because prairie people did not like Otto Lang's Liberal policies on the wheat board and the Crow rate, a policy this government chose to continue last Thursday and Friday.

Why is the government removing the competitive position in world trade that Canada's farmers now enjoy with the Crow and the wheat board?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Blais (Minister of Justice, Attorney General of Canada and Minister of State (Agriculture)): Madam Speaker, last Friday my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, tabled a document for consultation, prepared in close co-operation with our provincial colleagues in the course of federal-provincial conferences and meetings of our officials. I imagine that by the end of the year when this consultative process is over we will be able to make a final decision.

It is important that Canadian farmers support the government's aim to make the Crow rate better reflect the requirements of grain shipping today, as opposed to the situation as it was several decades ago. With that in mind, we decided to prepare a draft bill, consult Canadians, and with the help of the provinces and the people in the grain industry, find a solution that is acceptable to western producers, while ensuring that producers in other regions are not adversely affected by changes in the legislation.

• (1450)

[*English*]

Mr. Vic Althouse (Mackenzie): Madam Speaker, the minister forgot to mention anything about the initiative on the wheat board.

If these policy initiatives are as popular as he seems to indicate they are, can he explain why the member for Kindersley—Lloydminster and the member for Vegreville, two former agriculture ministers who know well the needs of prairie people, decided to quit after this announcement was made?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Blais (Minister of Justice, Attorney General of Canada and Minister of State (Agriculture)): Madam Speaker, I held back a little so I could answer the second question. I suppose the hon. member was referring to the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board. As of August 1, 1993 western barley producers will be free to sell their feed and malting barley in Canada or the United States either through the Canadian Wheat Board or through private companies. Overseas grain marketing will continue under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board.

I believe that the flexibility we are giving the Canadian Wheat Board is something that many producer groups had been seeking for a long time. I repeat, this merely reflects the need to make federal government programs more flexible and to adapt them to the needs of regional producers.

* * *

FIGHT AGAINST AIDS

Mr. Guy Saint-Julien (Abitibi): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

Yesterday during the *Opération Enfants-Soleil* Telethon on the TVA network, announcer Jean-Luc Mongrain said the federal government had done nothing to prevent the spread of AIDS or to support people living with by AIDS.

Could the minister explain what the federal government does to help people infected with HIV or living with AIDS and how AIDS can be prevented?

Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Madam Speaker, if Mr. Mongrain had

bothered to get in touch with the people in charge in Ottawa they could have told him that between 1990 and 1993 the federal government spent $97 million on various AIDS initiatives including information, research and assistance to community groups.

In addition to funding committed during the past three years, we recently announced an annual funding commitment of $42 million for five years, which means a total of $211 million and an increase of 13 per cent in order to complete current projects. Generally speaking, this initiative has been very well received by all parties.

My point is that if instead of making these kinds of statements Mr. Mongrain had bothered to make some inquiries, he would certainly have been given all the facts.

* * *

[*English*]

BOSNIA

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre): Madam Speaker, I would like to pose a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

This weekend the Prime Minister is quoted as saying that he is prepared to support the UN resolution setting up safe havens in Bosnia and is prepared to send more Canadian troops to that area. At the same time the Minister of National Defence is quoted as saying there are no more troops to send. Even at this late stage of the government's life, it is important on crucial matters such as this that there be some unity of view.

I want to ask the external affairs minister if Canada is prepared to send more troops on the UN resolution that was passed this weekend? Are we going to change the mandate of the troops that are there so they can defend civilians and will we be re-equipping those troops so that they can meet this risky and new assignment?

Hon. Barbara McDougall (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Madam Speaker, in response to the first part of the question, there is no difference of view on this. I have been asked myself and I have said I would ask our military what additional resources could be made available. The Prime Minister I think made the same implication. The Minister of National Defence said there could be some potential air cover or perhaps additional ships that would be made available.

• (1455)

We are providing some 20 per cent of the forces that are on the ground in Bosnia. If there are additional forces we can put in, I think we all recognize that it would not be a large number. There might be some infill. There might be some logistics. There might be the potential of people to provide air cover or ships and so on. What we are doing is trying to come up with a way of co-operating with the resolution on safe havens to the extent we can.

On the other part of the hon. member's question, the implementation and the change in mandate is something that is being looked at by the Secretary-General and he will be reporting back to the Security Council. I think it was to be done within seven days but may take a little longer. In the meantime he will be consulting with troop contributing countries, not just there but some who may not yet be there.

I will be meeting in Luxembourg on Wednesday with my European and U.S. counterparts while we examine the implications of implementation. I will be in a better position to answer the hon. member's question after that meeting.

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre): Madam Speaker, the minister knows the Security Council resolution specifically talks about ground troops and not more ships.

The troops that we have now must be re-equipped because they are not able at present to meet these new kinds of requirements.

Considering the serious implications of this decision plus the new dangerous position that our troops are in because of what happened in Somalia this weekend, does the government intend to live up to the commitment made last Thursday by the Prime Minister to have a full, open examination by Parliament of the new mandate, the new responsibilities and the new risk to Canadian peacekeepers so that Canadians will know exactly what situation they are being put into and whether in fact the Canadian people will consent to the decision the government is now looking at?

Hon. Barbara McDougall (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Madam Speaker, as yet there is no new mandate or any plan for implementation. That is why I am suggesting that after further discussions by the Secretary-General and my discussions with my colleagues, would be a more appropriate time to answer the hon. member's question and perhaps have a further parliamentary discussion.

We have always said that if there was a change we would be happy to have some form of parliamentary discussion, whether in committee, in the House or a full debate. I think we have to wait and see. At the moment there is not really anything to debate beyond the intention of the Security Council resolution. If the hon. member is patient I will have a better answer for him later in the week.

* * *

CHRISTINE LAMONT AND DAVID SPENCER

Mr. George S. Rideout (Moncton): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs and concerns the Spencer and Lamont case.

The minister has said the 28-year sentences were excessive and harsh and she would intervene if the sentences were not reduced. The Spencer and Lamont families have now been advised by their lawyers that leave to appeal has been denied.

The Department of External Affairs' and the minister's strategy have been an abysmal failure in this case. Unless the minister acts now, two Canadians will spend 28 years in a Brazilian jail under sentences which the justice committee found to be a gross miscarriage of justice under both Canadian and Brazilian law. Will the minister do the right thing and immediately request the expulsion?

Hon. Barbara McDougall (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Madam Speaker, as I understand it there is a further appeal process and that the families have said they are going to take advantage of it.

I had not said I would intervene. What I did say was it was not appropriate to intervene as long as there was legal process under way.

I should point out that there has been some considerable progress on one other aspect of this. The Brazilian lower house has ratified the exchange of offenders treaty. It is now in their upper house and we expect it to be ratified in the very near future, based on other precedents of debate in their upper house.

We have not seen the actual report on the judge's opinion. We are hoping to get a full report on that and we will look into all that. Since the families have said they will appeal, then we will assess the situation at that time.

* * *

• (1500)

FORESTRY

Mr. Brian L. Gardiner (Prince George—Bulkley Valley): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Forestry.

Canada's forest industry is in transition as all levels of government, industry and the environmental community try to come to grips with the demands on our forests. Of particular concern is the future of forestry industry jobs.

While governments create, rightly so, parks to protect the future of our forests and the special places they represent, and given the lack of any specific federal-provincial program to assist workers in the transition from these forest jobs to new employment, will the minister commit to bring forward such a program to assist forest workers who lose their jobs because of a very legitimate policy initiative by government to create parks?

Hon. Frank Oberle (Minister of Forestry): Madam Speaker, my hon. friend knows my views on this subject. The potential for workers who are being displaced through the rationalization and modernization of mills, all things being equal, find an easy transition to the management of the resource itself as we shift to more intensive, more integrated management regimes in forestry, regimes that respect all of the other values, not just the timber values, that we have previously managed.

It is in that area that the federal government has established new arrangements with the provinces. We are working co-operatively with the provinces and with industry to make this transition possible.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Charles A. Langlois (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and to Minister of National Defence): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table today, in both official languages, the government's response to nine petitions.

[*Editor's Note: See today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

* * *

[*English*]

INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATION

19TH REPORT OF CANADIAN NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

Mr. Bob Hicks (Scarborough East): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34 I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 19th report of the Canadian NATO Parliamentary Association concerning the NAA meeting of the Task Force on America and Europe, which was held in Washington, D.C. April 22-24, 1993.

* * *

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

CONCURRENCE IN NINTH REPORT OF STANDING JOINT COMMITTEE

Mr. Brian L. Gardiner (Prince George—Bulkley Valley): Madam Speaker, pursuant to the motion I put on the Order Paper on Friday I would like to move that the ninth report of the Standing Joint Committee for the Scrutiny of Regulations presented to the House on June 3, 1993 be concurred in.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, I would like at this time to move a motion respecting adjournment for Friday. As you know this is the Progressive Conservative convention. We have a tradition around here for the House not to be sitting for these events.

I would like to move:

That when the House adjourns on Thursday, June 10, 1993 it shall stand adjourned until Monday, June 14, 1993 at 11 a.m.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: On division.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

• (1505)

PETITIONS

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Mr. Len Taylor (The Battlefords—Meadow Lake): Madam Speaker, I have two petitions to present today. The first petition is signed by quite a number of residents of Canada, each of whom are expressing concern that the goods and services tax is an unfair form of taxation.

The petitioners call upon Parliament to reject the goods and services tax and to cause this government to bring in a fair taxation system for all Canadians.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. Len Taylor (The Battlefords—Meadow Lake): Madam Speaker, the second petition I am presenting today is signed by residents of my constituency, all of whom live in North Battleford or rural North Battleford, Saskatchewan. The petition was brought to me by Mr. Oliver Humphreys, an elderly fellow within my constituency.

The petition notes that the Government of Canada has enacted legislation providing for two official languages. The petitioners call upon Parliament to enact legislation providing for a referendum of the people binding on Parliament to accept or reject the two official languages.

TRADE

Mr. Jack Whittaker (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt): Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure, pursuant to Standing Order 36, to present a petition signed by people from all over my riding from Penticton, Cawston, Kere-

meos, Okanagan Falls, Osoyoos and various other places within my riding.

All of these people are concerned with the proposed North American free trade agreement and the resulting trade concessions being demanded of Canada.

They petition the House to reject the proposed North American free trade agreement and recommend to the government that it use the termination clause to end the Canada–U.S. Free Trade Agreement.

TAXATION

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition from people who want child care deductions deducted from income earned, particularly for families with special needs children and especially for single parent families. Some of these children with disabilities require special facilities and services which can be extremely costly.

The petitioners believe that the current laws are unfair, insensitive, discriminatory and must be reviewed.

[*Translation*]

I support their request.

[*English*]

SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES RESEARCH COUNCIL

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, I have a second petition.

I have pointed out a number of times in this House that Canada's major challenges are in the area of social issues: poverty, equity, unemployment, food banks, et cetera.

These petitioners want to delay the merger of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council with the Canada Council. They ask the government to stop its decision, to study it, to review it and then make a decision. This is what the petition asks and I support it completely.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. Lyle Vanclief (Prince Edward—Hastings): Madam Speaker, I table for 62 constituents in my riding a petition calling upon Parliament to enact legislation providing for a referendum of the people binding upon Parliament to accept or reject two official languages, English and French, for the government and the people of Canada.

The acceptance or rejection of the proposed amendments are to be determined by a majority of total votes cast in the whole of Canada, together with a majority vote in a majority of the provinces with the territories being given the status of one province.

Mrs. Christine Stewart (Northumberland): Madam Speaker, I am duty bound by Standing Order 36 to present the same petition on behalf of constituents in my riding who have concerns about the bilingual policy in Canada.

THREE GORGES DAM

Mrs. Christine Stewart (Northumberland): Madam Speaker, my second petition is from Canadians across this country who have grave concern about Canada's involvement in support of the Three Gorges Dam project in China.

They humbly pray and call upon the Parliament to pass the necessary legislation to prevent any further involvement by the Government of Canada in the Three Gorges Dam project.

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

Hon. Alan Redway (Don Valley East): Madam Speaker, today I present a petition that was inspired and spearheaded by Hugh McLafferty of Scarborough, Ontario and has been signed by over 150 residents of the greater Toronto area.

They express their great concern about the size of our national debt and the fact that we continue to have a very substantial deficit. The petitioners are calling on Parliament to reduce government spending by establishing a target deficit of zero for 1995–96, pass a private member's bill C–99 dealing with members' pensions,

enact the Senate reforms as proposed in the Charlottetown accord and eliminate the non-taxable allowances presently granted to public servants. All of this would allow Parliament to start repaying our national debt.

• (1510)

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Charles A. Langlois (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and to Minister of National Defence): Madam Speaker, Questions Nos. 267 and 326 will be answered today.

[*Text*]

Question No. 267—**Mr. Althouse:**

Since December 20, 1991, (*a*) how many times has the Prime Minister met personally with U.S. President George Bush and with EC President Jacques Delors to discuss the question of supply management and a clarified article XI.2(*c*)i in the GATT negotiations, what were the dates, places and results of these meetings and who was present (*b*) how many times has the Prime Minister met or talked on the telephone with the U.S. President and with EC President to promote the inclusion of a clarified article XI.2(*c*)i in the final GATT agreement and what were the dates and results of these conversations?

Mr. André Harvey (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): During meetings with President Bush on May 19-20, 1992 and President Delors on April 23 and December 17, 1992 the Prime Minister discussed the Uruguay round of the multilateral trade negotiations, including Canada's concerns over supply management and article XI of the GATT. In addition, the Prime Minister has had numerous telephone conversations with President Bush and President Delors and with other heads of government in which the Canadian government's concerns have been expressed. The Prime Minister also raised these issues with Chancellor Kohl, Prime Minister Major, President Mitterrand and Prime Minister Balladur during his May 6 to 14, 1993 official visit to Europe.

The Prime Minister has also instructed members of cabinet, in particular the Minister for International Trade and the Minister of Agriculture, to pursue our concerns over article XI bilaterally and multilaterally. This included their joint visit to Geneva and Brussels February 19-22, 1992, and various other meetings and telephone calls.

Question No. 326—**Mr. Young (Acadie):**

As of (a) April 1, 1985 (b) April 1, 1992, what was the total number of authorized person years in the Prime Minister's Office and the Privy Council Office and what was the total number of authorized senior level positions (EX, DM and SM)?

Mr. André Harvey (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): As of April 1, 1985 the total amount budgeted for personnel costs for the Privy Council Office was $20,326,000. The total amount budgeted for personnel costs for the Office of Prime Minister was $5,076,000. As of April 1, 1992 the total amount budgeted for personnel costs for the Privy Council Office was $28,986,000. The total amount budgeted for personnel costs for the Office of the Prime Minister was $4,639,000.

Authorized senior level positions are those target executive counts (TEC) provided to departments by the Treasury Board to establish a target number of executives (EX/SM only). These were previously referred to as management category complement authorities. As of April 1, 1985, the management category complement authority for the Privy Council Office was 39. As of April 1, 1992, the target executive complement for the Privy Council Office was 53.

[*Translation*]

Madam Deputy Speaker: The questions enumerated by the hon. parliamentary secretary have been answered.

Mr. Langlois: Madam Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Shall the other questions stand?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CANADA SHIPPING ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Corbeil, that Bill C-121, an act to amend the Canada Shipping Act and to amend another act in consequence thereof, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Jack Whittaker (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to stand today to not only ask a question but to comment in the the House of Commons with regard to the introductory remarks of the member for Skeena when he talked about the possibility of this being his last speech within the House of Commons. I just want to put on record that we in this

party and others in other parties in the House recognize the commitment that this member has had particularly in the last four and a half years in his role as environment critic for the New Democratic Party. The hard work that he has done in forwarding that cause—

Mr. Manley: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am sorry to interrupt but it sounded a bit like a eulogy. It seems to me that the hon. member for Skeena was the second speaker to take the floor at third reading on this bill and thus had a 40-minute time slot. I believe he exceeded the 20 minutes and I do not believe that there would be a question and comment period following that speech.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): I would say to the hon. member that I almost made the same mistake myself, but the Standing Orders clearly state that the minister who moves the motion is considered to have spoken on it. Therefore the hon. member for Skeena is the third speaker and not the second, even though the minister's speech was very brief, I admit. I think that my explanation is clear, but I can repeat it: the minister who moved the motion is considered to have taken the floor, even if he spoke for only five seconds. The hon. member for Skeena is therefore the third speaker.

[*English*]

Mr. Whittaker: As I was saying I was just recognizing the fact that this member has been committed to the environmental aspects of all legislation within this House. I wanted to recognize that just in case the opportunity did not arise to go on the record. I certainly have had admiration for the hard work that this member has done as environment critic. He has had a commitment to the environment and has followed through on all environmental causes for the betterment of future generations.

In leading directly to my question, I noticed that in his speech he set out the lack of interest that the government seems to have shown in the oil spills legislation. I was somewhat concerned with that. That also led me to wonder whether he could tell us about the Liberal participation in the development of this bill and of the additional changes that he sees required within the bill.

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the overly kind remarks from my friend and colleague.

Let me extend the same gratitude to a number of people who have participated in the development of Bill C-121. In particular there is the member for Victoria who ably, capably and efficiently—I think all members who attended would agree—carried through the business of not only hearing witnesses but of getting a large number of amendments dealt with in one rather long, protracted session that we had late last week. I think it took almost eight hours to get through the last series of amendments.

• (1515)

I pass on those remarks that were graciously handed to me to the chair and also to other members of the committee who went well out of their way to give many hours on very short notice to get a very difficult piece of legislation through. However, as I said moments ago, it was not as thorough or as far reaching or as competent as I think Canada's environment deserves.

On the member's question, the Liberals did have one member who was present at the committee hearings. Although they were allowed two they never did turn out either for the witnesses, the deliberations or for the votes on amendments.

Mrs. Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. My colleague from Ottawa South raised with you the issue of whether there should be a question or comment period on this speech from the member for Skeena.

The Table confirms that in fact the member spoke for beyond 20 minutes and therefore was not treated as the third speaker but as the second speaker.

Therefore I wonder if you could give the House some indication of whether the member, having spoken five minutes beyond his allotted time, is in fact considered to have consumed a 40 minute speaking slot for which there is no question and comment period. As an alternative, maybe the question and comment period should be reduced by the extra five minutes that the member spoke.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): The hon. member for Ottawa West is perfectly right; the Chair was too generous to the member for Skeena, and I admit it. That being said, there can still be a period for questions and comments and nothing prevented an opposition member from questioning the previous speaker. But it was the

Chair who was mistaken, or distracted if you prefer, not the member for Skeena.

I apologize. I think the simplest thing to do is to overlook this and to conclude the period for questions and comments, if the hon. member agrees. I also apologize to her colleague from Ottawa and I thank you for your co-operation.

The hon. member for Skeena has the floor.

[*English*]

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry the Liberals are so paranoid about me speaking on the oil spills legislation.

Let me try to sum up the last of the concerns that I have about this piece of legislation. Although it has had some improvement by going to committee it still has a number of inadequacies particularly in the area of prevention and on the phasing out of single hulls.

It has an inadequate timetable for the 10,000 tonne and 25,000 tonne regional response capacity. It has an inadequate compensation thread running through it not only in terms of liability and in terms of the polluter but also in terms of compensation to those who might try to collect from the fund. As I have already pointed out, this fund has been thoroughly drained by the Conservative Minister of Finance.

I think we should also keep in mind that the panel recommended that Canada needed to acquire clean up capacity five times what presently exists. Regrettably this legislation does not do that.

In terms of the question from my hon. friend, I would like to conclude by pointing out that the following percentages give some idea of where spills come from: 27 per cent from collisions, 28 per cent from groundings, 15 per cent from fires and explosions and 18 per cent from failures.

Regrettably this legislation does not target in on prevention, response or compensation the way it should. If there are any further questions I would be glad to take them.

Mrs. Catterall: Mr. Speaker, the member for Skeena accuses the Liberal opposition of being somewhat paranoid.

I must confess to a little paranoia with respect to the operations of the committee that was chaired by a member of his party. It was evident from the moment the hearings of the committee began that there had been collusion among the government, the chair of the committee and the NDP member of the committee to make sure that this bill got through without delaying its passage.

I felt that we should have heard adequately from environment groups and public interest groups.

• (1520)

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Speaker, I think you have listened with care as I have.

I do not know what kind of aspersions the member is trying to suggest toward the Chair, but if she wants to make a charge she should do so. Perhaps she would want to explain why the Liberals never turned out the number of members they were allowed, to either participate in the hearings or vote. There is big talk from the Liberals but no action.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): I would ask both hon. members, especially since this is one of the last speeches by the hon. member for Skeena, whose courtesy and great respect for Parliament I have always appreciated, to—

[*English*]

Mrs. Catterall: Mr. Speaker, as I said, the opening comments of the committee from the Chair were that there had been consultation and there was some agreement to proceed in a certain way.

I want to make it clear that the consultation was obviously between the NDP and the government because no member of the Official Opposition was included in those consultations. As the member referred to in his speech, I personally felt we gave very short shrift to a very important bill. There were numerous issues we did not go into and there were numerous witnesses we should have heard from who we did not hear from. The member referred to the shortage of environmental and public interest groups. I am wondering perhaps after the fact if he could explain clearly to the House what the

consultations were between his party and the government that rammed this bill through so quickly.

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Speaker, the member will not be able to produce a single letter today or name a single group that she or the Liberal Party contacted that wanted to appear and was denied the opportunity. This is the traditional Liberal trying to smear everybody with a dirty brush after she walked out on a number of witnesses, did not attend all of the witnesses and did not attend all the procedures in relation to the committee. When the member tries to cast aspersions at others—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): On a point of order, the hon. member for Ottawa West.

Mrs. Catterall: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order and a point of privilege.

I would have expected the member in his final week in the House to be more respectful of the House and the truth. The member knows perfectly well that I was there for every witness. When I was not at committee it was because I was required in the House.

Mr. Ross Belsher (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to speak this afternoon on Bill C-121. This is the third and final reading. When it leaves this House it will go on to the Senate.

In listening to the last exchange I might say that each party was briefed and each party's staff were briefed on the measures that were taking place at all stages as we went along. Having been a member of the legislative committee, there was a co-operative spirit from both sides of the committee room. In particular, the support and co-operation of the opposition members have been essential in getting this bill to the stage it is at today in this House.

The foregoing speaker said the minister did not speak on this important piece of legislation. I think if he looked at *Hansard* he would see that the minister did in fact speak very eloquently at second reading.

Mr. Manley: Don't push it.

Mr. Belsher: I would encourage the members if they doubt my words to read the speech of the minister who certainly laid out the framework of what is in this piece of legislation.

The legislative committee heard expert testimony from witnesses representing industry groups, investment groups, environmental groups as well as government experts in the field of pollution prevention and response. After consideration of this testimony the committee recommended important changes which will strengthen Bill C-121 in the areas of the public input through the clear delineation of roles and responsibility of the public advisory councils. They will also strengthen the Parliament oversight role to ensure that the important pollution response improvements are implemented on a timely basis.

• (1525)

The previous speaker referred to the advisory councils but we had to be very careful to make sure we were not asking the advisory councils to become the enforcement arm of this important piece of legislation. That is the role of the Coast Guard. But the commissioner who is a member of the Coast Guard certainly can have input from all these advisory councils.

We also accepted an amendment, and I forget which of the opposition members put it forward, which says there shall be an advisory council in each of the three geographic areas: the Pacific area; the Great Lakes, St. Lawrence River and Great Lakes basin; and the Atlantic and Arctic. It is very essential that there be advisory councils. If the commissioner feels there is something more specific, permission is given to put together advisory councils in those particular areas.

Bill C-121 represents an important piece of new legislation for protecting Canada's marine environment. This legislation forms a part of the government's marine environmental emergency strategy announced in June 1991. Mr. Brander-Smith from British Columbia was put in charge of a study. It took several months and cost in the order of $3 million. It heard from many organizations and travelled from coast to coast. The essential parts of this report have certainly been adhered to.

The hon. member for Skeena says it is not being done fast enough but speed and when it gets done are not the essential parts. It is important that we know what is

progressing and that it will be in place within a certain period of time.

We know this bill will accomplish a number of very important tasks. For example it will oblige the private sector to fund further improvements to marine spills response capability. It will increase the maximum fine for polluters to $1 million and authorize the adoption by Canada of two important international conventions.

During second reading debate on Bill C-121 and subsequently, members have expressed their concern that Bill C-121 does not adequately address the issues of marine pollution prevention which were identified in the public review panel report.

The government's marine environmental emergencies response strategy has indeed addressed many important pollution prevention activities. For example, after July of this year Canada will require that new tankers operating in Canadian waters have double hulls or equivalent environmental protection features. Existing tankers will be required to either be retrofitted or phased out.

This was worked out in concert with the marine traffic in the world market as well as the Americans. A timetable has been established as well as specifications of what will be required. Canada has been part of that and for that reason we felt it was not necessary to specifically put that type of provision in this piece of legislation.

The government's strategy has increased the level of foreign vessel inspection. It has expanded the aerial pollution surveillance on both coasts and has implemented numerous regulatory changes which have strengthened the pollution prevention functions.

In the Canada Shipping Act we already have the provision that the pollution control officer can direct where and when ships can go. He also has the power to make sure they alter what they are doing when they are doing it if he deems it necessary to make sure pollution or environmental aspects are being taken care of.

While all of these pollution prevention initiatives are very important, we must not forget the importance of being prepared to respond to spills. This is where Bill C-121 will play a critical role.

I want to thank all members of this House and particularly the members who participated in the committee that examined Bill C-121. It took us until 10 o'clock p.m. last Wednesday to go through this and all of us wished we could have had more time.

• (1530)

We know the summer recess is coming upon us and the amount of work the Coast Guard has done in the consultation process over the past two years has been very significant. We were told this when the Coast Guard came before us and gave testimony. This has not been glossed over. This is something that is very essential to the tanker traffic that takes place within Canadian waters.

The all-party agreement which has facilitated rapid consideration of this important bill is very much appreciated and signals the importance that all parties place on environmental issues. I add my thanks for the all-party agreement of last Friday. We brought report stage in and waved the 48-hour rule so we could have this debate today. This bill will be off to the Senate for its perusal as well.

We believe that Bill C-121 should be passed by the House to permit the early implementation of its important provisions which will improve Canada's capability to respond to marine spills. This bill has been formulated and put together with this in mind.

Again I want to say thank you to the members opposite for their input and the amendments they put to this bill. I believe with their amendments this bill is better leaving the House now on third reading than it was when it left here after second reading.

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member mentioned during his comments that we now have a date when the 10,000 tonne and 25,000 tonne emergency response capacity equipment will be available. As he knows, one of the amendments I put forward during the committee process gave the date of January 1, 1994 for that equipment to be in place. It also specified that double hulls be in place for all of Canada's fleet no later than January 1, 2000.

I wonder if the hon. member could tell Canadians the dates when the capacity will be up and running pursuant to the legislation. On what date will we have double hulls for the whole of the Canadian tanker fleet and where can we find those two things in the legislation?

Mr. Belsher: Mr. Speaker, as I have already said I did not feel it was necessary to put the dates for when there will be double-hulled vessels in our waters because this is something that has already been agreed to by the shipping community. That has been worked out within the international marketplace. I believe at the very outside the last date would be 2015. Dates have been ascertained and placed on each Canadian vessel that has

been listed in Canada as to when they will cease to exist for the role they are now carrying out in our own waters.

With regard to when the clean-up mechanisms will be in place we added amendments in 660.11. They state that the minister shall no later than one year after the coming into force of this act and thereafter every two years review the operation of the section of this act. If the minister deems there is not sufficient progress being made in making sure that the pollution controls are up and ready and the advisory committees are advising the commissioners they feel they are not ready, then the minister can unilaterally take that kind of action. The bill does not put a specific date.

The member knows that in British Columbia there is an organization called "Burrard Clean" which is funded by the oil companies. It has added a great deal of capability on the west coast. It has been completely funded by the industry and we hope it will never be called upon to use its total resources but the facilities are already there. The Coast Guard has always had the responsibility for north of 60 and that will continue to be the case.

As we go into each of the other sections across our country other organizations will have to be brought to the fore as well to take the leadership in this.

• (1535)

Mrs. Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I just want to confirm something with the hon. member. We have had some discussions about an error in the committee's report to Parliament which shows a difference in the French and English versions with respect to clause 6 on page 7.

I believe we have agreement concerning the time I speak. I am told by the Table that it is necessary to seek unanimous consent to have the English brought into conformity with the French. I am seeking the assurance of the member from the government side that consent will be given.

Mr. Belsher: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member opposite for being alert and bringing that to the attention of this House. Certainly we would be glad to give our agreement such that the English version should read the same as the French because there is a misplacing of a clause in there. We would certainly agree to that.

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Speaker, the House will thank my sharp-eyed friend from Ottawa West for having caught that problem. I trust the Table understands that the unanimous consent that is being given now by the House is to bring the English into direct compliance with the French. It is the French that is correct. It is the English that has the error.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is there unanimous consent of the House to correct the English version of the bill?

An hon. member: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Agreed and so ordered.

Mr. John Manley (Ottawa South): Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by referring to the parliamentary secretary's gratitude to us for hurrying this bill through.

I would not say his gratitude is misplaced because indeed we did try to be co-operative in seeing that Bill C-121 came into law before we found ourselves in a dissolution of Parliament and off into an election campaign for fear that it would possibly take a good number of months before this legislation could be enacted.

It is legislation that we support. We believe it is a measurable improvement to the existing situation and therefore we were keen to see it go through.

However I would like to point out, as I did at second reading of this bill, that we do not feel the government dealt with the issue of oil spills in a sufficiently prompt and open fashion. This bill has come forward very late in the parliamentary cycle for no good reason. This is in the face of the Brander-Smith report and in the face of requests as pointed out by the Auditor General of Canada and requests from cabinet that there be a departmental response for the Brander-Smith report.

As the Auditor General pointed out, no response was forthcoming until we finally found ourselves not that long ago presented with Bill C-121 and a request to deal with it on an urgent and expedited basis so that it could become enacted.

It was with the co-operation of members of the legislative committee who were appointed to deal with this issue that the matter was able to be heard through the committee quickly but certainly without the advantage of widespread consultation and based on an understanding that any proposals or any kind of significant or substantive change to the bill as proposed would not be accepted. By substantive change I refer to any introduction of a charge such as that recommended by the Brander-Smith panel on ships that did not have double hulls or double bottoms.

The lack of ability to get into what is really the essence of this bill and to provide for substantial change I think has weakened the process. While as I say we are glad to have it through at least in the sense that it does provide an advance on the existing state of legislation with respect to oil spills, I think it is our view—and I wish to signal this—that it is not an adequate response. It is an interim response and more will need to be done soon.

The Brander-Smith report we will recall came as a result of a panel appointed in June 1989. The panel held extensive hearings across the country and examined the question not only of response to oil spills, which this bill primarily deals with, but also prevention.

• (1540)

I think it is very worthwhile for Canadians to understand what an important problem this is. We tend to have our attention attracted by dramatic spills such as the *Exxon Valdez* of course and the breakup of the ship the Braer off the coast of the Shetland Islands last January. That ship was destined on that voyage for Canada and would have been entering Canadian waters within days of its breakup on the Shetland Islands. Its sister ship at that time was in a Canadian port.

While we focus on these very dramatic breakups the reality is that the spillage of oil and other dangerous products for that matter is a continuing problem on a regular basis world-wide. According to the Brander-Smith report: "According to available research data more than one major spill from a tanker accident will occur in Canadian waters every year. These large spills cause visible and devastating damage to the environment. We have been told by experts that they are inevitable. Presumably this is because human error in one form or another is the cause of most tanker accidents and human error can never be completely eradicated. Faced with the possibility of catastrophic environmental damage it is understandable that at the hearings Canadians questioned whether so much error really is normal. For the purpose of illustration the Alaska oil spill commission which studied the 44,000 tonne *Exxon Valdez* spill in 1989 compared the *Exxon Valdez* tanker operation to the U.S. airline industry and estimated that one and a half airline crashes would occur every day in the United States if airline safety was no better than tanker safety. A spill of the same magnitude as that from the *Exxon Valdez* could happen at any moment in Canadian waters. Indeed without better prevention efforts it will happen".

Brander-Smith goes on to say that unless the situation changes Canada will experience over 100 small spills, about 10 moderate spills and at least 1 major spill every year based on current levels of tanker traffic. A catastrophic spill in the order of 10,000 tonnes can be expected about once every 15 years.

What we are talking about here is not the remote and inconsequential occurrences that may happen from time to time by unavoidable accidents, but the continuing risk of major spillage of oil off our coasts if we are not in a position to act to prevent it.

Brander-Smith's commission comes in its opening chapter to some very startling—at least to me—conclusions. They say that they were appointed to consider two questions. First, are tankers safe? Second, are we capable of responding effectively to spills and mitigating their environmental consequences? I again quote: "The answer to both questions is an unequivocal no". Brander-Smith finds that our tankers are not safe and our ability to respond to a major spill is inadequate.

The thrust of this report was that the first priority needed to be prevention. When we talk about prevention in the case of oil spills we know because of the human error factor that prevention can never be absolutely ascertained. However, it is clear that improving the structures of ships and tankers is key to limiting the occurrence of oil spills off our coasts and other coasts.

• (1545)

Therefore by virtue of international agreement new tankers are being built with double hulls. Over time single hulled vessels will gradually be eliminated. That in itself is not a total solution.

I think it is generally conceded that had the *Braer* been double-hulled it still would have broken up off the coast of the Shetland Islands. The sea was simply too high. Because of its location on the rocks in that situation even a double hull would not have prevented that one.

The key point is this. Because so many of these disasters are caused by the human factor the technology of the ships must be such that it compensates for the occurrence of human error.

Double hulling or double bottoming is a major contribution to that. What we do know is that many of the ships on the seas today carrying oil products are capable with a very small error of judgment by a ship's crew to contributing to a major environmental disaster such as that which we have seen in Alaska when the *Exxon Valdez* went down.

I think it is also important to put into perspective the size of some of these spills. We will recall from my previous quotation that the *Exxon Valdez* was a 44,000 tonne vessel. Consider the spills that have occurred recently.

In 1988 the *Athenian Venture* broke up in the North Atlantic *en route* to Come-by-Chance, Newfoundland. It was 27,000 tonnes. The *Amoco Cadiz* in 1978 off the French coast spilled 220,000 tonnes. Remember that the *Exxon Valdez* was 44,000 tonnes. The *Torrey Canyon* in 1967 off the English coast was 117,000 tonnes.

On it goes. The *Nestucca* spill caused significant damage off the west coast of Vancouver Island. I think the member for Skeena referred to this one in his speech. It was only 875 tonnes and relatively small compared to some of the others. There were mystery spills which killed an estimated 18,000 sea birds in Newfoundland in January 1990. These were likely a fraction of the size of the *Nestucca* spill. The *Nestucca* was 875 tonnes and the *Exxon Valdez* was 44,000 tonnes. We get into some of these large vessels and we are into the range of 200,000 tonnes or five times larger than the *Exxon Valdez* spill. The catastrophe which we court if we fail to deal with this is of giant proportions.

I had the occasion a year or so ago to visit with my colleagues, the member for Dartmouth and the member for Burin—St. George's, at a number of shipyards in Atlantic Canada. If I might be permitted a slight digression I can say that if there is anything that we need in Canada in our industrial sector it is a strategy to deal with the problems that our shipyards in various parts of the country have been facing. These shipyards are on the east coast and west coast and are even along the St. Lawrence.

This is an industry in which highly skilled, well trained and well paid individuals are finding that the work has just simply disappeared. What an opportunity it is to rebuild some of our shipyards on the basis of rebuilding some of our ships.

There is a need to encourage a rapid conversion to double-bottomed and double-hulled vessels. These can be retrofitted on existing vessels. This should be obvious. It could stimulate a very significant improvement in the prospects of many of our shipyards if that were to advance at a more rapid rate.

• (1550)

The Brander-Smith report had a number of things to say about prevention in addition to the levy which has been discussed at some length by previous speakers that would have encouraged the use of double hulled vessels and double bottomed vessels. It has also suggested that the Canadian Coast Guard should be given additional resources to significantly expand its capacity to inspect foreign tankers and ensure on-board compliance with statutory manning requirements and ship schedules.

The best rules in the world are inadequate if they are not enforced. The Coast Guard has given us assurances that it has increased the rate of inspection on vessels in Canadian waters so that it does inspect vessels on an annual basis. I think all of us look at the estimates of the Coast Guard and wonder where it is getting the resources to carry out this additional responsibility.

I do not know whether the assurances are reliable or not, but it seems to me clear that the resources the Coast Guard have are being increasingly stretched. Whether the ability is there to perform the tasks which the *Braer*, the *Valdez* and the other spills have demonstrated are so

crucial, is a question of whether those resources are adequate.

Brander–Smith recommended that the Coast Guard develop more stringent operating and chartering guidelines for tankers. Some progress is being made on that. The Coast Guard needs to work closely with chemical and shipping industries to develop training and certification programs for tanker and terminal personnel that emphasizes safety and pollution prevention, design construction and inspection standards for chemical barges as well as tankers.

Brander–Smith says that to deter polluters the Coast Guard must deploy three dedicated aircraft—east coast, west coast and the Great Lakes–St. Lawrence—equipped with spill detection and evidence gathering technology. Clearly this is essential if we are going to have any confidence that the rules are being enforced.

Brander–Smith says that to improve its investigative and prosecution capability the Coast Guard must deploy additional personnel, appropriate technology and equipment and designate larger numbers of more rigorously trained pollution prevention officers. It must also issue stricter regulations governing loading, unloading and transfer operations at terminals to reduce the risk of operational spills.

I go through these one by one to emphasize the fact that the focus needs to be not just on the response to spills, which is really the key component of Bill C–121, and obviously an objective which we support, but on prevention. Clean–up is never adequate, it will never be adequate. We can hope to do better, we can hope to do the best that technology permits, but prevention is the key to the environmental imperative which this bill, at least in form, attempts to acknowledge.

The other important point to make is that also included in our concerns about this bill is adequate reference to the issue of compensation. We have seen the devastating consequences of a major spill on our coasts. It is of course questionable whether compensation can ever be adequate in the case of a major spill. What has often been the case where there are even minor spills is that the burden of clean–up has fallen on local communities, local residents of shorelines, often on volunteers who come from distances in order to contribute to assisting the clean–up, the saving of wildlife, and so on.

There needs to be a clear legal responsibility for compensating for the costs of those clean–up operations. That is something which requires additional work. There are jurisdictional questions that abound on that issue. It is an important area of further effort. Again, had there been more time for a bill such as this I think that a committee would have studied that issue as well as some of the other issues at much greater length.

• (1555)

In conclusion, I will reiterate once again the fact that we want to see this bill enacted. We would like to see it through the Senate as quickly as possible. The parliamentary secretary refers to it going to the Senate. That is not the only thing going to the Senate these days. For some of the other arrivals in the Senate one thinks of oil spills as well, but that is another matter.

An hon. member: Natural disasters you mean.

Mr. Manley: In the spirit of co–operation that we have had around this bill I think that it is important that we see it enacted into law as soon as possible with improvements and changes to come in due course, I hope very soon.

* * *

TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT

NOTICE OF ALLOCATION OF TIME TO CONSIDER REPORT AND THIRD READING STAGES OF BILL C–62

Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister for Science and Minister of State (Small Business and Tourism)): Mr. Speaker, an agreement could not be reached under the provisions of Standing Order 78(1) or (2) with respect to report stage and third reading of Bill C–62, an act respecting telecommunications.

Therefore, under the provisions of Standing Order 78(3), I wish to give notice of my intention to move a time allocation motion at the next sitting of the House for the purpose of allocating a specified number of days or hours for the consideration and disposal of proceedings at the said stages.

Some hon. members: Shame.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. corbeil that Bill C-121, an act to amend the Canada Shipping Act and to amend another act in consequence thereof be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Ron MacDonald (Dartmouth): Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully to the comments by my colleague from Ottawa and I would like to say that I concur.

Living on the east coast of Canada, and indeed having been born and raised in Cape Breton at the head of the shores of Sydney harbour, I have a keen interest and understanding about the problems which this bill seeks to remedy.

I remember as a young boy growing up in New Waterford where many times we would have storms. At one point, down by the Barachois Cove, New Waterford, during a particularly early vicious storm I saw a tanker and two barges come ashore just down the road from where I lived. Thank goodness the two barges were empty of oil and the tanker was empty as well. They were coming in trying to seek some respite from the storm.

Clearly, growing up close to a marine environment as I did in Atlantic Canada it becomes very, very clear that the effects of a tanker spill or of a disaster such as when a ship sinks or comes ashore and loses its oil cargo, its diesel fuel, the impact on the marine ecosystem are absolutely devastating.

I recall that when small ships went down close to the mouth of Sydney harbour we would lose our beaches. We could not swim there, not just for one or two months but for a couple of years. It would take the ice-clampers coming down to remove the oil for the winter and take it somewhere else. It was not that it dissipated, it went to somebody else's beach.

My colleague mentioned one thing that perhaps this bill should be dealing with that it does not is the whole issue of prevention. He talked about double hulling and double bottoming of these tankers that are plying waters. It is something that this government should have really grappled with. Indeed he made some reference to a visit that he made to somebody at the East Coast Shipyards which is reducing the number of people in its work force because business simply is not there.

However in the Irving yard in Saint John, New Brunswick when we were looking at the frigate program, it was clear that one of the things that they see as an imperative is legislation which would require quickly double hulling and double bottoming of vessels that are plying Canadian waters. Not only is that good for the environment, but it is also good for the Saint John shipyards and other shipyards in Canada which would see their levels of employment at least stabilize and perhaps—just perhaps because that particular yard is one of the best mid-sized shipbuilding yards in Canada—see the employment levels go up.

He also talked about the Canadian Coast Guard maybe not having the resources. The Canadian Coast Guard's east coast base is in my riding of Dartmouth. I know that it has been under the gun over the last number of years as this government seeks to cut wherever it can.

The third thing is who does pay? When we deal with prevention which may be a costly matter, we are also dealing with some cost effective measures, societal, environmentally and employment wise.

• (1600)

I want to ask my colleague who is the transport critic for the Liberal Party if he believes that the government has been short-sighted in not bringing in legislation that would see prevention as the number one priority legislatively as opposed to compensation once these spills do occur.

Mr. Manley: Mr. Speaker, my colleague makes the point that we have before us legislation that does not focus on prevention or compensation but simply on response and perhaps a minimum measure in that area.

I suppose to be entirely fair the answer is very simply this. This government has sought to find a legislative formula that would not provoke too much controversy in the shipping industry over the course of the next few months when it is going to the public, but which would enable it to bring forward legislation to say what it has done about marine spills as a result of the *Exxon Valdez* and the Brander-Smith report. What we have is this legislation. It has more or less insisted that the opposi-

tion parties accede to rapid timetables to see that it is enacted, albeit thinking that it is inadequate.

I suppose having just heard the minister of state for small businesses get up and bring the closure motion with respect to the telecommunications bill, we may well assume that closure would have been brought down on this bill as well if either of the opposition parties had insisted on a fuller process. The reality is very simply this. The government did find a formula that the shipping industry was willing to live with and that is what it has put in this bill. It did not concern itself overly with the view of environmental groups, especially when it got agreement from most of the environmental groups as well as from the opposition parties that this bill was a measurable improvement of the *status quo* and therefore merited support. So far, so good.

We face the prospect, and we can almost hear the rhetoric now, of the Tory Party going out on the hustings this summer claiming that this is one of the things that it has done for the environment. It did something for the shipping industry because that industry knew that measures were coming. It feared the imposition of the levy recommended by Brander–Smith and lobbied ferociously to prevent it, successfully as it turned out, and was willing to accede to this legislation in the hope that perhaps at least for a number of years that would be the end of it.

As far as I am concerned my colleagues and our party agree, this will not be the end of it if we have something to say about it, and we will have something to say about it.

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I have just a short question to the member for Ottawa South.

I think the member is aware of the legislation passed in 1973. The ship–oil source pollution fund was converted in 1989 into the maritime pollution compensation fund which has a present value of $200 million. Just for the record I think it is important to get at least the word out that even the Coast Guard admits that that is an inadequate compensation fund for many of the sizes of accidents that our coastline faces.

Does the member agree that section 7(10), as is now included in Bill C–121, by providing a reverse onus provision at least provides up to $200 million in accessible compensation should there be a major accident?

Mr. Manley: Mr. Speaker, I agree.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Lambton—Middlesex—National Defence; the hon. member for Cape Breton—East Richmond—National Defence; the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie—Peacekeeping; the hon. member for St. Boniface—Student Aid; the hon. member for Saskatoon–Clark's Crossing—The Economy.

Mrs. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West): Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate that this has been rather a whirlwind process of getting through this bill. We are supporting the bill as it is important and useful. However it is an insufficient step forward with respect to protecting Canada's waterways from the damage of oil spills.

• (1605)

Nonetheless I cannot stand here with any certainty and assure the House or the public that the provisions of this bill are as good as they could be or as tight as they could be. As my colleague from Ottawa South has said, the urgency to get this bill through the House before the House rises and to achieve something out of the very important Brander–Smith report that was completed two years ago unfortunately did not allow us time in committee to give the important consideration we normally would give to a bill of this nature.

I would like to review a bit of history. The country certainly owes a debt to David Brander–Smith and the co–members of his review panel on tanker safety. The report that came out of that review is called *Protecting our Waters*. That is what the report is all about and it is certainly what this bill is all about.

The committee, and the House, is at a bit of a disadvantage in assessing the value of this legislation against the much more comprehensive recommendations made by Mr. Brander–Smith in his report. We are at a bit of a disadvantage because there has been no comprehensive response yet from the government to the Brander–Smith report. Therefore we cannot know what

this legislation does to meet the very strong recommendations of the report and what it leaves undone.

We have partial knowledge and therefore we are dealing with the bill in somewhat of a vacuum. May I recall that the departmental briefing on the bill was still going on as the bill was being debated on the floor of the House of Commons. There has been that kind of urgency and inadequate time for reflection and for ensuring that this is the best possible bill in the time available.

The government still has not tabled its comprehensive response to David Brander–Smith's report and that may mean that this Parliament will end without that report ever having been tabled or debated, without Canadians having the opportunity to judge the adequacy of the government's responses to the report against the urgency of the danger to our environment and public health and safety from continuing oil and chemical spills.

We know that some measures have been taken. One of the major findings of the panel inquiry was the total inadequacy of the resources—human resources, financial resources, equipment resources, and training resources—being provided to the Coast Guard to even begin to prevent the spills much less respond to spills when they did occur.

We know that some measures have been taken to improve the response capability and the inspection capability of the Coast Guard. It was only during the hearings on this bill that we had an opportunity to look at what resources have been provided and to focus on the implications of the fact that those resources have not been provided to the department as part of its ongoing funding to carry out the mandate this Parliament has given it through legislation but that this is temporary funding under the green plan.

Of the issues that need to be revisited certainly one is to ensure that the Coast Guard has the ongoing resources to do its job. We need to ensure that when it is necessary that green plan funds are cut back or shifted somewhere else or when the now six–year green plan program comes to an end we will not go back to inspecting only 8 per cent of vessels entering Canadian waters with oil on board.

• (1610)

In addition to that I certainly question the legitimacy of designating a basic fundamental legal responsibility of our Coast Guard and our ministry of transport as green plan funds. The green plan was to be new money and new programs, not merely repackaged ongoing standard government programs. If protection of our waterways is not considered an ongoing standard government program but a new initiative then most people who have read the legislation of this Parliament would find that quite a surprise.

The bill is clearly focused on response to oil spills after they have occurred and not to prevention of oil spills. That is the next major gap that truly needs to be addressed. We do not have a prevention strategy but a mop–up strategy in this legislation.

I am going to come back to some preventive measures that have been ignored, certainly as far as this bill goes. Some of them have been touched on by other speakers.

However, first I want to talk about what will ensure that the momentum to protect our waters, as the review panel said, carries on. It became evident during the committee hearings that the lessons of the earth summit in Rio just a year ago have not yet permeated federal government planning and federal government policy development.

The Minister of the Environment stood in this House time after time, and in press conferences and public meetings, and spoke about the importance of the Rio process in protecting our environment, the importance that the decision and policy–making process be transparent, accessible to a wide range of interests and inclusive, that people from a wide range of sectors, business, labour, environmental interests and education be able to sit down together and come to a concerted *projet de société*, as the minister has called it, for the protection of our environment.

This bill before us today is very clearly the product of the industry, in consultation with the government no doubt. It is clearly the bill the industry wants. As a member who sat on that committee I cannot give this House or the public, nor can the government, any assurance that this is the best bill, that this industry sponsored, industry designed and industry implemented system is the best. I cannot say it is not but I cannot say it is because it has been a very narrow process.

Others who were interested in participating in discussions were not able to do so. Unless they had the money to get themselves to meetings from one end of the country to the other and give up their normal paying work for many days at a time to participate in those meetings they could not do it. We cannot have what the Minister of the Environment keeps saying we need, a transparent, accessible and inclusive process, if money is a barrier to people participating.

Clearly our officials at all levels need to find the mechanisms and need to learn the ways to include a broad range of public interests when they are developing policy on issues as important as the protection of our waterways.

We have to remember that Canada has one of the longest coastlines in the world. In the Great Lakes there is 20 per cent of the freshwater of the entire planet.

This bill deals with all those waterways: the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence and all our coastlines, east, west and north. To have come this far without the public interest, whether through environmental groups or local organizations on the sea coasts or on the Great Lakes, being involved in developing that best system is simply not the kind of process we can accept for the future.

• (1615)

When the legislative committee held its first meeting after a week's absence from the House, the industry representatives were all lined up to appear as witnesses. At that point no environmental group had been contacted by the committee, its clerk or its chair. It was a mad scramble to try to hear at least some environmental perspective on this legislation.

We certainly should have been able to hear from at least the citizens' perspective on the east coast, the west coast, the Great Lakes and the Arctic. We simply were not able to do that because responsible organizations, volunteer organizations largely, do not have the budget to hire somebody to prepare a report for them overnight. Responsible organizations are not going to submit to a parliamentary committee something they consider inadequate.

Nonetheless we were able to make some changes that I think are positive in the legislation through a variety of amendments. We were able to strengthen the advisory councils' role so that on an ongoing basis, a system is being put in place by which Bill C–121 will be subject to public scrutiny. Those advisory councils will have the ability, not necessarily the mandate or the direction, but at least the ability, if they choose, to get their views through to government and Parliament.

What we have not dealt with, and my colleague from Ottawa South touched on it, is the great importance of people who live by our waterways for protecting them. It may be many hours, it may be a day or more, before a formal commercial relationship to respond to an oil spill can be put in place.

Certainly the committee learned, if we did not know already, about the crucial importance of people who live by our oceans, live on our Great Lakes and live along the St. Lawrence in responding to spills, people who spontaneously respond when they see a risk to their environment.

There is nothing in this or in any other legislation that guarantees them compensation for expenses they might incur and any kind of indemnity for damage they might do in the course of carrying out this volunteer operation. In fact there is no mechanism for involving volunteers in the effort to protect our environment. That is certainly a further step in the development of this legislation that is absolutely necessary.

There were a number of other concerns brought to our attention, for instance by cruise ship lines and other environmental groups, that we simply were not able to address.

Finally, I want to briefly discuss the Brander–Smith report and indicate a few other areas. Others have spoken about double hulling and double bottoming being perhaps the most important prevention measure we can take. There is no binding provision in this bill to assure Canadians that this will happen at any time in the future. There is certainly not the assurance recommended by the Brander–Smith report that it be accomplished within seven years.

My colleague from Ottawa South has also referred to the job generation potential if Canada were to speed up a schedule for double hulling and double bottoming in some severely economically disadvantaged regions of our country.

Let me point out another economic benefit of doing this. Increasingly countries that are able to provide environmentally sound services around the world are going to have a competitive advantage in the international marketplace.

If we speeded up the double hulling and double bottoming of Canada's fleet we could have a significant competitive advantage in international shipping, and not too long from now.

• (1620)

Let me just refer to a couple of other measures that have yet to be addressed which came out of the Brander–Smith report. The abandoning of the $2 a tonne levy or, as my colleague from Skeena is fond of saying, a penny a pound on oil and oil products transported in Canadian waters, significantly reduces the flexibility of government to do what needs to be done, not on a short–term green plan basis but in the long term.

What is totally ignored in this bill is the issue of chemical spills and the response capability on chemical spills. We know this is a complex bill. We know it is tied in with international negotiations that are ongoing. My colleague from Ottawa South and I would both like to assure the House and the Canadian public that we know that this is unfinished business and that we have a commitment to continue overseeing what is going on in those international discussions and completing the business of protecting our waters.

Mr. Ross Belsher (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency): Mr. Speaker, we would be remiss if we were to intimate to the Canadian people that there were not consultations conducted all during the process leading up to this legislation.

There were witnesses who appeared before us that said there were 13 full detailed days, which included representatives from the environment department who in turn would then communicate back to their constituency. This is a transportation bill so why would they not be consulting with the shipping industry and the Coast Guard, which was taking the lead role for that?

Be it as it may, we know that through the last number of years there have been many situations in which upgrading the prevention of spillage is already taking place, and that is continuing.

This legislation is needed so that we can have the clout to bring the force of law in order to prosecute people who do pollute our shores or any of our environmental areas. There is a balance with this. Everyone would like to do it all immediately. Both the opposition parties would make us think that the government has unlimited resources to put into this. We have to be prudent as to how we go about it.

Is this bill perfect? No, nobody has ever said it is perfect. Can it be improved? Yes, I am certain it can be improved but at least it is a step in the right direction. It is something that we need. It will go on to aid us and be of benefit to us in future years.

Did any of our witnesses say that we should not pass this bill? Not one. Everyone said yes, please pass it. Some said that they wished there could be more in it. However every witness without exception, including the group that spoke on behalf of the environmentalists from British Columbia which is a very large organization, said to pass it. Brander–Smith, the author of the report the hon. members referred to, said that this is going in the right direction and that we should pass this legislation.

I would not want us not to put on the record today that the witnesses told us to please get on and pass this legislation before we take our summer recess.

Mrs. Catterall: Mr. Speaker, that is precisely why the Liberal Party is supporting this legislation. It is equally important when we pass a piece of legislation that we know it takes only one small step and we can see that it is only a first step. There is still a great deal more to be done. We must not delude ourselves, and I do not think that the hon. parliamentary secretary intends to do that.

We must not delude ourselves that by passing this one piece of legislation we are giving Canadians either the sufficient or necessary assurance of the safety of their waters from oil spills or an adequate and full response when spills do occur.

• (1625)

I want to come back to the issue of consultation because, as the Minister of the Environment keeps pointing out in the House, the whole function of bringing different people together who have an interest in issues like this one is fundamental to solving those problems in the future.

Turning to prevention, we cannot parcel that out and say the Ministry of Transport does not have to deal with environmentalists, that it can siphon that off to the environment department. The Minister of the Environment has repeatedly said the Ministry of the Environment is not a watch-dog of other departments.

Consideration of the environment must be integrated into all departments. It must become a consideration in all policy development. People were informed but when it came to who sat down at the table at the Transport Institute in Cornwall to actually thrash out what should be in the bill, it was the industry. It was not an independent group that represented a broader public interest.

This is an evolutionary process, but we cannot on the one hand have the Minister of the Environment saying that every department has to look after the environmental concerns within its area of responsibility and on the other hand have the Minister of Transport saying we are passing it over to the Ministry of the Environment to look after the environmental consultations.

The whole concept of the national round table, *le projet de la societé*, is based on bringing all the parties together and integrating the environment into all our policy making.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.

* * *

EXPORT DEVELOPMENT ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND—CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENT

Hon. Monique Landry (for the Minister for International Trade) moved the second reading of, and concurrence in, the amendment made by the Senate to Bill C-118, an act to amend the Export Development Act.

Motion agreed to, amendment read the second time and concurred in.

* * *

INVESTMENT CANADA ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-89, an act to amend the Investment Canada Act, as reported (without amendment) from a legislative committee.

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): There are three motions on the Notice Paper at report stage of Bill C-89, an act to amend the Investment Canada Act.

[*Translation*]

Motion No. 1, standing in the name of the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie, will be debated and voted on separately.

[*English*]

Motion No. 2, standing in the name of the hon. member for Edmonton Southeast, is out of order as it goes beyond the scope of the bill as agreed to in principle at the second reading stage. I would refer the hon. member to Beauchesne's sixth edition, citation 698(1). Accordingly Motion No. 2 will not be selected.

[*Translation*]

Motion No. 3, standing in the name of the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie, will be debated and voted on separately.

[*English*]

I shall now propose Motion No. 1 to the House.

• (1630)

Mr. Steve Butland (Sault Ste. Marie) moved:

Motion No. 1.

That Bill C-89 be amended in Clause 2 by striking out line 21 at page 1 and substituting the following therefor:

"of, or with any other entity or person after consulting with the government of the province, and".

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring forth this amendment to Bill C-89. I thought the government side was going to have some empathy for it and perhaps support it. However I am told that this did not happen. I understand that Investment Canada also expressed some

concern about the precedent being set with the amendment.

Although perhaps the perception of the amendment could have been innocuous, I did not look at it that way. I was hoping the government would see it in a fashion that would not be terribly consequential to the bill. However the principle of the amendment should be supported without question by all members of the House.

The clause of the bill would allow Investment Canada in my reading of the wording to circumvent, if one wants to use that word, or go around the arms of government such as provincial governments which Investment Canada in the past had probably dealt with on a regular basis. It indicated at committee stage that it was prepared to continue to do this. It was just a matter of courtesy, one would think. If Investment Canada is going to deal with an entrepreneur somewhere out there with a prospective investment in Canada or a takeover of an industry or business in Canada, the provincial government should know about it at the very least.

The amendment was suggesting to formalize it, to put into the legislation that Investment Canada must do that. I did not think it was too much to ask. Apparently Investment Canada says that it is too much to ask, that we should not bother informing the provincial government about this action. I guess that goes right to the principle of the bill which gives us concern.

The concern is that people or arms of the government other than the government itself are making these kinds of decisions. Perhaps in perspective, in the global overview of this bill and a whole host of other bills like free trade and NAFTA, this pales in comparison. Nevertheless the fact that Investment Canada would not accede to supporting the amendment is bothersome at the least. It is irksome that it would not go for it and it disturbs me.

We would encourage the government because government members are probably quite accepting of the amendment. I would encourage the government to supersede, to show who is in charge. Is it the government or is it Investment Canada?

Maybe the wording of the amendment would allow it not to be terribly powerful or potent. Maybe it would not do very much other than to say to the premier and the minister of industry and trade in the provinces that it is about to do something and ask what they think. This era of supposed harmonious provincial–federal relations almost begs that we do so.

We encourage the government and the Official Opposition to support the amendment.

Mr. Peter L. McCreath (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, I will briefly respond to my hon. colleague. He has put this motion forward in good faith and with the best of intentions with respect to the suggestion that Investment Canada should not proceed in areas that are going to impact negatively on provinces and so on.

• (1635)

I would like to say to him that the word consultation means different things to different people. Perhaps it is the use of the word consultation or the requirement with respect to consultation. What is involved here is that the purpose of the amendment, not my hon. friend's amendment but the amendment to the Investment Canada Act, is to give the minister the power to enter into agreements with entities in the private sector primarily designed to share the monetary cost of an investment promotion project. We are talking about agreements that generally speaking would involve less than $100,000 and would have minimal, if any, impact on provincial government policies or programs.

On the other hand if we legislate a requirement for consultation and there was some difference of opinion as to what consultation involved or what the implications of it were, the result could be quite a significant delay in implementing it. I would point out to my hon. friend it is routine practice on the part of Investment Canada to consult in any event with its provincial counterparts on promotional activities, particularly if there is some suggestion that it may impact directly on a province.

The concern my hon. friend brings forward is a very legitimate one. In fact it is already accommodated in the manner by which Investment Canada carries out its affairs. There is some concern relative to the impact of the precedent involved, in writing the concept of consultation as to what it may or may not mean. Therefore it is the view of the government that the amendment, while

perhaps meritorious in its intent, is in fact not necessary and therefore will not be supported by the government.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Some hon. members: On division.

Motion No. 1 negatived

Mr. Steve Butland (Sault Ste. Marie) moved:

Motion No. 3

That Bill C-89 be amended by deleting Clause 3.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this amendment is a much more consequential one and impacts upon the legislation. It deals with the oil and gas sector.

For the benefit of those who may be watching and trying to comprehend exactly what we are up to, clause 3 would extend to U.S. investors and U.S. investors only in Canadian oil and gas enterprises. It would be the same review thresholds as apply to other sectors of the economy under the free trade agreement.

Is this free trade driven or is it legislation in isolation? We suspect that all along the Americans would be pushing and pressing for it and would have their way with us once again.

Under the free trade agreement some sectors of the Canadian economy have been opened to American investors in the sense that FTA permits higher thresholds for review of U.S. investments than for investments from other countries.

Other sectors however have been explicitly excluded from the favourable treatment under the free trade agreement. These sectors included oil, gas, uranium, financial institutions, transportation and culture.

However the bill will bring forward and remove that onerous restriction upon American investment. Clause 3 would remove the oil and gas sector from the exempted or reserved sector, an action that is consistent with the general thrust of the 1985 act, setting more liberal standards for an investment and setting more liberal standards certainly for American investment without any sense of review.

We believe it is already suggested in the free trade agreement that we must guarantee the Americans access in times of energy shortage in Canada to the supply they are already receiving. This is a further aggravation of the free trade agreement. That is why we have suggested that this clause be completely deleted to ensure that oil and gas is protected like whatever little else is protected under our trade laws with the United States.

• (1640)

Mr. Peter L. McCreath (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, I will just respond very briefly to my hon. friend by reminding the House that this amendment is of course the completion of the policy that was announced by the energy minister some months ago.

By increasing the threshold we in fact increase the access of opportunity for Canadian companies. It is interesting to note that the investments made by Canadian companies and the Canadian share of ownership of the oil and gas sector have in fact increased since that policy change was announced because of course it makes Canadian companies more attractive for investment purposes.

The issues raised by my hon. friend were discussed very thoroughly in committee and I think the points were adequately made there. It would seem that if the government were to agree to this amendment then it would have been pointless to bring forward the bill in the first place. This amendment would in effect nullify the bill.

We obviously feel that the bill would be beneficial to the industry. I think this has been demonstrated by the investment impact of the announcements.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): The question is on Motion No. 3. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Motion No. 3 negatived.

Hon. Tom Hockin (for the Minister of Industry, Science and Technology) moved that the bill be concurred in.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

Motion agreed to.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): When shall the bill be read a third time?

Mr. McCreath: Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions and I think you will find there is consent to proceed directly to third reading.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is there unanimous consent to proceed to the third reading?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Hon. Tom Hockin (for the Minister of Industry, Science and Technology) moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Peter L. McCreath (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, I apologize that the title is so long. The three proposed amendments to the Investment Canada Act under Bill C–89 are intended to facilitate the attraction of more international business investment to Canada. The amendments will help Canadian companies attract the capital and technology they need to grow and compete in an evolving global marketplace.

Globally the role and importance of international investments have resulted in fierce international competition for capital and other benefits which come with investment, technology, management skills, market access and jobs.

The Investment Canada Act recognizes that Canadian prosperity was dependent not only on welcoming international investment but also in establishing a business and investment climate in Canada that would encourage increased levels of investment by Canadians and non-Canadians.

As the minister has stated, the creation of such a business and investment climate has made Canada a more attractive site for domestic and international investment. A major reform of the tax system and substantial deregulation of the transportation, telecommunications, energy and financial services sectors has helped to open the Canadian economy to international competition and investment. Bill C–89 represents a further step on the track to attract, facilitate and increase international business investment in Canada.

• (1645)

The first amendment will extend to investors in the oil and gas sectors the same review thresholds that apply to other sectors of the economy under the Canada–U.S. Free Trade Agreement. For U.S. investors this will raise the thresholds above which an acquisition becomes subject in the act to $152 million for direct acquisitions. There is no review for indirect acquisitions.

For all other international investors thresholds for review will remain at $5 million for direct acquisitions and $50 million for indirect acquisitions.

Canadian owners of oil and gas properties will be able to sell their properties to any investor for the best return and rationalize their holdings. Similarly international owners may now make acquisitions which have a strategic fit with their existing holdings. The over–all result will be an enhancement of the value of the resource base for all investors and a stronger Canadian exploration and producing industry.

The second proposed amendment will enable Investment Canada to enter into agreements with Canadian companies or business associations to share the costs of programs and initiatives designed to attract international capital and technology to Canadian companies. Such international investments and investment partners are critical to the ability of Canadian companies to compete, grow and provide jobs for Canadians.

Since 1989 the agency as part of the federal government's investment development program has worked with many Canadian companies to assist them in finding them international investment partners. During that time Investment Canada has facilitated deals between Canadian companies and international investors as part of the federal government's investment development program. An increasing number of Canadian companies and business associations are now prepared to share the cost of seeking international investment and finding investment partners.

The third amendment relates to the cultural sector. The support of a strong cultural sector is a priority of the government. The amendment will give the minister new powers to determine whether or not a business entity in the cultural sector is Canadian controlled.

The retroactive provisions are designed to discourage an investor from quickly completing an investment which could not withstand the scrutiny of the minister using new powers as of June 19, 1992. Investment Canada is active in promoting Canada as an attractive investment destination. The main thrust of the amendments to the Investment Canada Act is to increase the attractiveness of Canada's investment environment and to facilitate cost sharing between the private sector and governments in seeking investment initiatives.

Clearly this legislation is in the interests of Canada and the economic development opportunities for all Canadians. I encourage all members of the House to give it their support.

[*Translation*]

Mr. David Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast): Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment briefly on this bill, and I believe the hon. member from Montreal will also speak to it.

[*English*]

I think it was indicated earlier that an amendment of mine would have said that investors from the Asian Pacific region and from places other than the United States should have the same right to invest in the oil and gas sector in Canada as do the Americans under this bill.

It seemed to me and I think to members of the committee that it was not very sensible to say one group of investors, albeit important ones living to the south of us, can invest in the Canadian oil and gas industry but someone from Japan, Taiwan, South Korea, Indonesia or any other place among the two billion people who live on the Pacific Rim would not have the same right.

Therefore my amendment would have simply said that everybody would be treated the same. It seems to me that is a pretty reasonable thing today when everybody from Kiev to virtually any corner of the earth now is looking for foreign investment and investors to invest in their economies to make them more efficient and so on. We would be treating non-Americans the same as we treat Americans under this bill. Perhaps it was you, Mr. Speaker, who made the ruling that the amendment was out of order and went beyond the terms of the bill. I must defer to that ruling. The Canadian economy is being opened up almost weekly. Although, as my colleague will say, the cultural industries are in fact being tightened up with respect to foreign ownership. I believe she will have comments on that issue. The rest of Canadian industry is being opened up to foreign investors and that is not always, but mostly, to our neighbours from the south.

• (1650)

A brewery in the United Stated is buying 20 per cent of Molson Breweries. AT&T is acquiring 20 per cent of Canada's new long distance phone company Unitel. American Airlines is seeking 33 per cent of Canadian Airlines International. The three American companies Mobil, Chevron and Murphy will end up owning approximately two-thirds of the Hibernia oil field as I am sure one is aware.

There have already been substantial foreign investments in Canada's energy sector. Consider Alberta's oil sands. I wonder if anyone knows that this constitutes a veritable Saudi Arabia in Canada's own backyard in terms of its oil reserves potential. Increasingly, Americans and more recently people from Japan and China have invested in our oil sands.

Mitsubishi Oil America now has 5 per cent of Syncrude which is one of the great Canadian success stories in terms of turning an enormous resource into jobs, income, profits, income taxes and so on.

JAPEX has invested $6.5 million in the Alberta oil sands technology of horizontal drilling.

Last year a Chinese oil company, the China National Petroleum Corporation became the first foreign investor in the oil sands research facility at Fort McMurray, Alberta. The Chinese will invest $6.5 million over the next two years in AOSTRA.

In April of this year the acquisition of control of Westcoast Petroleum by a group of Hong Kong based companies was approved. Those investors intend to support WPL's business plan which calls for an increase

in capital spending in Canada from $53 million in 1992 to $96 million in 1997. That represents a lot of new jobs and a lot of opportunities for young people coming out of our universities and people with trades and people with a desire to work in the oil sector in western Canada. They will also seek to introduce WPL to oil and gas exploration and development opportunities in China and other countries in the Far East. This hopefully will not include Burma until the democratic government takes over there.

There is also the question of Numac Oil & Gas Ltd. which is based in Edmonton and the fact that that company will indirectly fall under ownership by people who live primarily in Hong Kong. Then of course there is the famous 1991 case of the Hong Kong financier, Li Ka-shing, who spent $250 million to complete his Husky Oil takeover.

In many countries around the world foreign investment laws have been liberalized to reduce or eliminate restrictions on foreign ownership and to place foreign investment under more equal footing with local investors. Governments have also introduced legislation aimed at reducing taxes on foreign remittances or on foreigners reinvesting profits in the local economy.

One might be interested in knowing that the Japanese share of foreign direct investment in the U.S. has climbed from 6.2 per cent in 1980 to 16.2 per cent in 1989.

Where does all of this leave us? I know that there are many people who do not want to see further takeovers of Canadian industry by non-Canadians. There is 11.4 per cent unemployment. Some 40,000 to 50,000 people in my own city are now officially unemployed. Employment is largely a function of investments and the more investment we can get in Canada—this is in my view and I am speaking only for myself—from any place in the world, then the more jobs that will be created in this country. Indeed, the next government, which I hope will be a Liberal government, will have to work very hard at setting a better business environment than this government in office now has done. I guess I would cite as example number one the last budget. It is probably one of the worst received budgets in Canadian history in the view of both Canadians and the foreign investor community alike.

Mr. Hockin: No increase in taxes.

Mr. Kilgour: All my Ph.D. friend can whisper across the floor is: "No increase in taxes". There is something that he does not want me to say but I think I should say it in the interest of fairness. This government, as everybody in this House knows, has either added or created approximately 38 taxes since it took office in 1984. The average family in Canada is now paying approximately $2,000 more in taxes since the Conservatives took over. That is one of the many reasons why, along with their profligacy, the helicopters being one of the first examples which comes to mind, they will be voted out of office no matter who they elect as the new leader.

• (1655)

Mr. Manley: Besides there were tax increases in the budget.

Mr. Hockin: Name one.

Mr. Manley: The GST reduction in rebate to the poor is an increase in the fiscal year.

Mr. Kilgour: Since we are talking about the GST, I have the most recent figures showing that abominable tax took in $29.6 billion in gross revenues last year. After reimbursements, tax rebates and administration costs were taken out it netted approximately $14.5 billion or less than 50 per cent on every $1 it took in. That should be in *The Guinness Book of Records* for the tax that took the most and netted the least of any government perhaps on the face of the earth. It is one of the reasons why we are proud to say that we will repeal that tax and ask Canadians how we can best replace the missing revenue.

I guess I am getting a little off subject, although I am not surprised that the minister who I think is retiring wants to—

Mr. Hockin: No.

Mr. Kilgour: Oh, excuse me. He is the only one today who is not retiring.

Mr. Manley: At least not voluntarily.

Mr. Kilgour: At least not voluntarily. I think his voters will have something to say about that.

In conclusion, as an Albertan and the energy critic for my party I welcome the move in this direction. I just wonder why it has taken this government until its dying

days literally and the dying days of this Parliament to recognize that the world has changed and people in virtually every country on the face of the earth will now do virtually anything to attract foreign investment except, as I think the member for Mount Royal is going to say, in the area of cultural industries.

Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal): Mr. Speaker, I intend to only address those sections of the bill that deal with the direct and indirect take over of the book publishing companies.

This Investment Canada bill addresses a very sensitive and important area of Canada's cultural life. It is an area where our writers are able to express a point of view and indicate from their own Canadian perspective matters that can have intellectual interest and importance. It leads to such writers as Michael Ondaatje winning the Booker Prize and Antonine Maillet winning the Goncourt Prize. We have all kinds of Canadian prize winners. We need to be able to build up from the base and strengthen the cultural potential which is found not only in book publishing but in all the other aspects of cultural expression such as film, video, dance, theatre, et cetera.

This particular bill directs itself to changes which the government is implementing in its new book publishing policy as announced by the Minister of Communications in January 1992. This new policy from the perspective of the Official Opposition establishes foreign investment rules with the potential to undermine the structures of the Canadian book publishing industry.

In an attempt to sell the deal to the Canadian industry, the government announced with a great deal of fanfare a $20 million subsidy to Canadian controlled publishers in an attempt to literally sugar-coat the bitter ownership policy and camouflage the real issue of what was taking place.

In presenting these new initiatives, the communications minister claims he was in the midst of strengthening the foreign investment rules and the new funding represents a substantial increase in federal money. That is really stretching it to say it mildly. If the impact of the postal subsidies alone was taken into account we would not really be addressing the question of this new $20 million fund which the minister was so pleased to announce.

• (1700)

It took the Association of Canadian Publishers a short while before it recognized this was no present. It was wrapped in very pretty packaging but when it was looked at and analyzed it realized that it really was not a very good idea. It passed a resolution at its meeting expressing great concern about the government's retreat from policies aimed at achieving Canadian ownership and control of the book publishing industry in Canada. It also expressed time and again its very firm opposition to any policy that would permit foreign takeover of Canadian-owned firms in book publishing and distribution.

To understand the new investment regime it is really necessary to know what it is replacing. I will give a little historic background. In May 1985 the minister at that time, the hon. member for Frontenac, established with the government's approval what was known as the Baie Comeau policy and we all know what a beautiful part of the world Baie Comeau is. He was in a position to table a very enlightened approach to book publishing which would have addressed much of the buy around problems and the sale of Canadian book sellers. The rules that he established at that time were to apply equally to all new investments as well as existing book publishers of Canadian origin in this country.

In a nutshell, if any existing owner decided to sell controlling interest it had to be sold to a Canadian. It was not a case of writing it off and telling it to divest. When the moment came if it was interested in selling to either a Canadian company or a company owned by foreign multinationals it had to be put up for sale to an indigenous Canadian company. If the takeover of a publishing company in Canada was either direct or indirect the end result was for it to end up in Canadian hands.

That was a very enlightened policy. The minister is to be congratulated for developing a policy to enable this industry to grow and flourish as Canadian cultural products and industry are growing in this land. In 1985 the government believed these changes were necessary and the key to strengthening Canadian industrial strategies and structures for the future.

Currently three out of four books sold in Canada are foreign. For this industry that really amounts to over $750 million leaving Canada each year as the book sales are in excess of $1 billion. Our markets are dominated by major multinational foreign companies. The Baie Comeau policy was to address that problem just as the foreign ownership limits on broadcasting were instrumental in repatriating the broadcasting industry in Canada in the late 1960s and built up the cable industry. We have very

successful and important entrepreneurial undertakings in this country. This was like the next step not in the broadcasting field but now in the book publishing field.

What were the results of Baie Comeau? Initially it was very exciting. It was very positive. There was significant progress made toward the objectives that were stated. The major retail chain, W.H. Smith, became Canadian controlled. An important book wholesaler, John Coutts Ltd., returned to Canadian ownership. The Doubleday Book Clubs were brought under Canadian control with a resulting fivefold increase in sales of Canadian authored books.

For the first time Canadian controlled publishers handled an increasing share of the distribution of imported books which amounted to about 70 per cent of the book sales in Canada.

• (1705)

The government should have been so proud of the minister's memorandum of understanding initiatives. They were productive and effective and it looked like we were heading toward a very exciting new future for book publishing in this country.

Despite assurances to the contrary, the government proved unwilling to implement the Baie Comeau policy after signing the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement. Is that not amazing? The free trade agreement just happened to interfere with the end goal sought by the United States. Who remembers the famous scorched earth letters that came from Ambassador Gotlieb when Prentice-Hall and Time Warner threatened us here in Canada with all kinds of sanctions? It was really quite a disgraceful display. Not only was the film distribution bill buried which would have allowed for the growth and development of our films, distribution and marketing program and projects, but again it impacted on our own publishing industry.

Legislative amendments that were needed to give the Baie Comeau policy teeth and require approval before rather than after investments were completed and require that real control rests with Canadians were never made. Although the minister was creative, he was never able to convince his colleagues. He did not get it through cabinet which is just too bad and free trade won out once again.

It would have been marvellous if there was freer trade and a fair playing field. We could have had some sense that there was a part for all of us on the North American continent to have the kind of trade that would be good for everybody, for all the people who live in this wonderful land. That was too much to hope for from this government.

Canadians who actively tried to buy a company called Ginn Canada found out that real control was not for sale. I say real not in *guillemets* but in reality. Canadians could have equity control but not in decision-making or on the board. Any veto power remained in American or foreigners' hands.

What kind of business man would knowingly invest most of his money in an equity position in a company or business and then not have control over decisions about how to make the company work? Who would invest in such a decision-making process? Not very many enlightened people who have big money to invest would undertake such an activity when they would not be able to have real control over the company in the end. It would not be smart business at all. Needless to say Ginn Company remained in foreign hands.

The new and supposedly improved ownership policy now of this Minister of Communications will permit foreign takeovers of most companies. The exception is foreign acquisitions of businesses owned by Canadians. Now, that really makes sense does it not? These will not be allowed unless the business is in "clear financial distress". The irony here is that foreigners can sell healthy companies but Canadians can only sell sick ones. Tell me that makes sense. That is sick.

The government says its goal is still to strengthen Canadian ownership and control foreign investors. While generally allowed to buy control, foreign investors will be asked for commitments likely to benefit the Canadian controlled sector. They have not demonstrated much will to do that to date. I want to know what the incentive measure is that is going to make them do it now.

The $20 million a year in additional direct funding which the government said it provided as an incentive for Canadian control is far from that. Investment Canada, in this new environment, is only going to approve foreign takeovers of Canadian businesses if they are of net benefit to Canada and the Canadian control sector of the industry. The first big test took place on November 27, 1992 when Investment Canada approved the foreign takeover of HarperCollins by Rupert Murdoch's News International. Canadian publishers have been vigilantly watching this takeover. It is not the Liberal Party, not this side of the House, but the industry itself which disputes whether or not there is net benefit to the Canadian sector.

• (1710)

For example, recently Canada book publisher Avie Bennett argued with Investment Canada's statement that HarperCollins publishing had produced 111 new Canadian titles from June 1991 to June 1992. This was their claim, that they had improved and increased the Canadian market for Canadian publishers and Canadian writers. Bennett claims that in his search of the National Library catalogues it showed far fewer titles even if he included pamphlets and reprints in the survey. Something was a little bit wrong with how we did the counting.

Stan Cover, president and chief executive officer of HarperCollins Canada, says that in fact HarperCollins had published 20 more titles than Investment Canada's stated 111 titles. There is the dilemma. Who was right and who was wrong? Does it really matter as long as we just do not control our own companies? I am not sure it does, but my understanding is that the centre of the dispute here lies in the question of what is a title.

For example, does it include pamphlets and reprints of books originally published by others or is the printing of a book first as a hard cover, then second as a trade paper quality, two different titles or is that one title? These are the kinds of questions that Investment Canada needs to address before further acquisitions are allowed.

I had hoped that when this went to legislative committee this would be looked at. It is unfortunate that it was not.

Presently Canadians await Investment Canada's decision as to whether the foreign takeovers of Canadian subsidiaries Collier–Macmillan and Grolier will be allowed. These have been before Investment Canada for over two years without a decision. There we had Harper-Collins, Grolier, Collier–Macmillan, Ginn, a whole series of these things.

Hearken back to what I said at the beginning, that at the very outset it looked like a very positive move forward and the industry was growing. Now we see the sad result of no positive action, no forward vision by this government in respect to the cultural industries.

The interest of the Canadian book publishing industry would be well served and still could be well served if Investment Canada within its undertakings and perhaps through regulations will at least require Investment Canada's approval prior to the takeover as opposed to after, which is presently the case. I would point out that this would be similar to the procedure with the sale or takeover of television or radio companies with the CRTC and telephone companies for that matter like B.C. Tel. I really think that has to be looked at very carefully.

The Minister of Communications has acknowledged the importance of strengthening the domestic book publishing industry and I support that statement. I wish he would put it into action rather than just language. He has invited the publishers to hold his feet to the coals to make sure he follows through on that commitment. We know this Minister of Communications likes to please everybody. The problem is we have not had any legislation that seems to please the forward movement and the growth and development of these cultural industries.

Unfortunately it is not the Minister of Communications who will be making the decisions. Maybe I am being unfair to the Minister of Communications because I do not know that he has much strength in there. It is not he who will make decisions on new foreign investments. It is the Minister for International Trade whose feet the American publishing industry has already very successfully scorched in a much hotter fire. What Canada's cultural industries need is strong action by this Conservative government, not just the fluff and the language of prepackaging. It is very good at that kind of marketing and sales. The only thing is that when you open that package it is empty.

• (1715)

What Canadian culture needs is a government that is committed to its growth and development, a government committed to understand that a country that does not have an identity is not a country of any value. It must recognize that only those countries that have promoted the arts and cultural industries and architecture and things of that nature have remained and left a mark in the evolution of world society.

Look at what this government has done to the Canada Council, forcing it into a remarriage that it does not want, cutting it and starving it. Look at what it has done to the CBC, Radio Canada International, Telefilm, the National Film Board, to all those agencies and organizations which are key and vital to the public lending rights which also is related to books and publishing and Canadian presence and Canadian return.

There is no commitment by this government to this whole sector. How foolish it is because it could be an enormous growing sector of the economy and bring billions of dollars into the gross national product of Canada.

With that I would like to say that this sector of the bill certainly does not speak in the interests of the book publishing industry and it is a regrettable fact but perhaps the government might tinker with it and fix it up under regulations.

Mr. Steve Butland (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to deal with the contents of the bill after having proposed a couple of amendments, one of which I thought would be acceptable. It was not.

The bill is kind of ironic because on one hand it is suggesting that we open the doors for investment, particularly American investment. On the other hand through the cultural components of the bill, it will be as good or as bad as the next minister will be. If he or she chooses to use the anti-avoidance clause of this bill, it could have some teeth.

On one hand we laud that aspect of it but again it will very much depend on the desire and whim of the next minister. If that minister chooses to be Canadian culturally oriented it may in fact be a positive.

On one hand we are saying we must protect and if one were suspicious one would say on the other hand the bill says we should open the doors, Americans come on in. There will be no review of investment whatsoever.

This is dealing particularly and specifically with oil and gas but I think we would be loath not to bring in the whole mandate of Investment Canada. There have been 10,000 cases come forward for review by Investment Canada. The number that has been turned down is absolutely zero. Not one of those 10,000 was turned down.

Immediately one has to be suspicious. Canadians are probably not aware of this. I am sure when they hear the number zero for 10,000 they will immediately become concerned. They will say foreign investment is required. American investment is required but at the same time a complete open-door policy is not acceptable to us.

On the one hand we are saying let us open the doors for American investment. On the other hand we sign a free trade agreement which does just the opposite. In fact Canadian investment in the United States is outdoing American investment in Canada.

What is the reason for that? Free trade has encouraged Canadian investment in the United States and discouraged American and other investment in Canada.

• (1720)

I read an article just yesterday on North Carolina. They are doing a booming business there since free trade because it is called a right to work state, which means there is no minimum wage. There were tragedies beyond telling in North Carolina where these people work in factories, resembling the Maquiladora in Mexico, with absolutely no health and safety standards. In fact just two weeks ago we read about people trying to escape from a poultry factory and could not get out when there was a fire because the doors were chained.

There is no such thing as a workmen's compensation board. If in North Carolina your body breaks down because of the work load, so what? You are on your own. You are on the scrap heap. There are human tragedy stories that are in Canadian newspapers, Canadian publications, for all of us to see.

On the one hand we are saying: "Americans, come on in". But on the other hand it is really a discouragement. Why invest in Canada? This Investment Canada mandate says no reviews are necessary, absolutely none. There used to be a threshold of five. It had gone up to, I

do not know, around 152 million and now there is no threshold at all. That must give all of us concern.

The debate comes up from time to time as to how much foreign ownership is acceptable. We do not wish to discourage foreign ownership but without any review in place it is not acceptable. I think Canadians reject that.

As for unresolved investment issues, I used this at second reading but I think it is worthy of repeating. This comes from a supporter of the government, an economist who supports government policy: "Canadian negotiators were not as successful in other areas of negotiation with the United States. For one thing, Americans continue to refuse to abdicate their rights to apply extraterritorially to American subsidiaries operating in Canada". In other words the U.S. government reserves the right to apply American laws to subsidiaries of American companies operating in Canada. It does not need to have any due regard for Canadian law even though they are operating in Canada. This plays right hand in hand, arm in arm with trade policy.

All the trade harassment that is going on is based solely on American trade law and whether the Americans are applying trade law correctly or not. It is very easy to apply and it is very easy to get through their Department of Commerce, very easy. Their rules are there to protect industry. Our rules are here to uphold the law. We are great law-abiding citizens and we have put down Canadian law to be fair to everybody. We want to be fair to everybody, but in particular we want to be fair to the United States and to Americana investors.

We say that this legislation cannot be dealt with in isolation. It is part of a much larger package that has taken away from the Canadian government the ability not to restrict but the ability to have any say. It has taken away its jurisdiction over investment in Canada. All of these bills continually circumvent the Canadian identity, the Canadian sovereignty.

Not being against investment, we have grave concerns about the bill in isolation because it is a part of a much larger package. That is why we are opposed.

As I said earlier, it is ironic. There is the temptation to applaud the cultural components of the bill. We believe there is an anti-avoidance clause and we hope that that will be implemented, but once again that will be as good or as bad as the next minister would want it to be.

For that reason we will be opposing the bill.

• (1725)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.

Mr. James: Mr. Speaker, it would probably be agreeable to all parties if we moved to proceedings on the adjournment motion once the appropriate members are here.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is there unanimous consent of the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

SITTING SUSPENDED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Under the circumstances, I believe it would be advisable to suspend the proceedings to the call of the Chair, but not later than 6 p.m., when we will have the proceedings on the adjournment motion.

At 5.26 p.m., the sitting of the House was suspended.

SITTING RESUMED

The House resumed at 5.31 p.m.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Hon. Ralph Ferguson (Lambton—Middlesex): Mr. Speaker, in the House on May 13, 1993 I asked the Minister of National Defence if he could tell us why the maintenance work on the Challenger military and executive aircraft was being done in Hartford, Connecticut, and why the government was ignoring our own Canadian skilled workers and letting these jobs go to the United States.

I should point out that the first aircraft arrived in Hartford for maintenance about mid-April 1993, well ahead of when I asked my question.

The minister admitted that the maintenance would be done in Hartford until a new contract was in place, which would be a matter of weeks. Now, almost four weeks later, we are aware this servicing in Hartford may go on until 1994, in fact well into 1994. Consequently the information given in the minister's answer is not correct.

I have in my possession copies of *Business Opportunities* of November 1992, May 7, 1993 and May 17, 1993. The request for proposals indicated that work would begin April 1, 1993 and end March 31, 1996, with an option for a further two-year period ending on March 31, 1998.

The closing date was amended as of the May 7, 1993 publication and again on May 17, 1993. *Business Opportunities* revealed that the closing date was amended yet again. In the meantime this work involving several thousand man-hours will take place in Hartford, Connecticut.

Let me refer to the issues. Why are Canadian military aircraft being serviced in the United States when our own skilled persons are facing lay-offs and our facilities are being underutilized? Second, why are we creating American jobs? The U.S. does not permit its aircraft to be serviced in other countries. Third, what are we paying in terms of an hourly rate to have this work done in the United States? Has the government looked at what it could be done for in Canada?

In light of the fact the Challenger jet was developed and built in Canada, I simply cannot believe we cannot get the maintenance work done in Canada at a cheaper rate than is currently being paid in the United States which would result in savings to our taxpayers. In fact I know this is the case.

Is this a repeat of the Conservative government decision of the late 1950s that resulted in the scrapping of the Avro Arrow and the world's first commercial jet passenger plane? This decision destroyed Canada's role as a leader in aircraft technology. Even today the Avro Arrow would still be a world leader in technology and design.

I would appreciate answers to these questions.

Mr. Ken James (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to respond to the hon. member for Lambton—Middlesex on this subject and to be able to clarify the situation if I can for him. Maybe the hon. member is not aware of some of the facts in this regard.

The Minister of Supply and Services, as the hon. member knows, responded to him on May 13, 1993. He put forward some of the facts. Canadair-Bombardier Inc., as is known, has been performing the repair and overhaul on the DND Challenger aircraft for the past five years at the Montreal service centre.

• (1735)

Bombardier advised the Government of Canada that for business reasons it was no longer interested in performing these services at the service centre in Montreal. Bombardier further advised that the service centre would be shut down but that the maintenance work would be performed at its service centre in Hartford, Connecticut.

As a result the Government of Canada has gone out to the Canadian aerospace industry to complete the work and for a Canadian location for the next five years, someone to do it for the next five years. The bid closing date is August 25, 1993.

To allow time for the competitive process it was necessary to extend the contract with Bombardier for a six-month period ending September 30, 1993. During

this interim period, because the Montreal service centre has been closed, Bombardier will maintain the service at the Hartford service centre.

The hon. member indicates that the cost of maintaining the Challenger aircraft at Hartford is higher than the cost of maintaining them in Montreal. This is not the fact. Bombardier has not increased the maintenance fees. They remain the same as they were when the work was being carried out in Montreal.

I am also pleased to report to the hon. member that there has been no loss of employment in Canada as a result of the Montreal service centre closure. All workers have been moved to other jobs within Bombardier.

The government believes in the competitive process. It is working to that end in having a new contract by the end of August.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. David Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, on May 11 I put a question to the Minister of National Defence pertaining to the policy of the Department of National Defence as it relates to peacekeeping duties.

This policy, namely section 3, has been used in the past to deny Canadian Jews, Muslims and women the chance to represent their country in peacekeeping activities in the Middle East. The question that I posed to the minister at that time was: Why did the minister prevent Jews, Muslims and women from serving Canada in the Middle East but permit a known white supremacist to serve in Somalia?

The response received from the Minister of National of Defence was totally inadequate, totally barren of any sensitivity to the issue whatsoever.

In point of fact my colleague from Windsor West prevailed in the House two days later and asked questions of the Government of Canada again. I just want to quote my colleague who said:

> The high reputation of our Canadian Armed Forces is based in large part on its proud record of battle in the Second World War when it fought against those who bore the swastika flag and the acts of inhumanity and injustice associated with it.
>
> Yesterday the minister was quoted as suggesting that a currently serving member of the Canadian Armed Forces who erected a swastika flag in a Canadian military barracks and then stood under it giving the Hitler salute and wearing a Nazi T-shirt was just engaging in a "boyish prank".

Any reasonable Canadian would conclude that kind of conduct is unbecoming of individuals associated with the Canadian Armed Forces, in particular with the peacekeeping movement of which Canada and Canadians have been proud for many years. In fact, Mr. Speaker, your predecessor who held office in this great Chamber was one of the ones who was very much instrumental in the whole concept of peacekeepers.

To add insult to injury, the government had the audacity to say that it did not approve of white supremacists in the Canadian Armed Forces. The individual in question to whom reference has been made was subsequently promoted and thereafter sent to a country which was primarily a country of black individuals.

I can understand mistakes being made, but this is incompetence at the highest level by the Minister of National Defence. I am not going to accept from the parliamentary secretary, who will be answering on the minister's behalf, that somehow we have misconstrued the facts or misinterpreted the facts.

The facts are very clear. This Minister of National Defence wishes to put the blame on other members of her department, namely senior individuals within the Department of National Defence, in trying to by-pass her responsibility as minister in charge.

• (1740)

It is very reminiscent of an earlier occasion when the minister of constitutional affairs, who was then the minister of external affairs, tried to abdicate his responsibility with regard to ministerial responsibility.

I want the parliamentary secretary to indicate to the House today the reasons this individual was allowed to remain in the Canadian Armed Forces, promoted, and thereafter sent to Somalia in order to serve. This has caused embarrassment for Canadians. It has brought attention to the Canadian peacekeepers that is not in keeping with their good reputation and well deserved honours. I want the parliamentary secretary on behalf of the Minister of National Defence to apologize to Parliament and Canadians for this gross act of negligence on the part of the Government of Canada.

Mr. Ken James (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the hon. member for Cape Breton—East Richmond. I would like to remind the hon. member that racist behaviour is not and will not be tolerated in the Canadian forces. The Canadian forces has a zero tolerance policy against all forms of personal harassment.

The Minister of National Defence has clearly stated that racism and racist attitudes are completely and absolutely unacceptable in the Canadian forces. If a person applying to the Canadian forces demonstrates such an attitude of extreme intolerance to others then the applicant will be rejected as he or she would be unable to fit into the team concept essential to an effective military force.

The Minister of National Defence is reviewing the Canadian forces recruitment policies to ensure that the explicit and stated policy of the Canadian forces that racist attitudes are absolutely unacceptable is in fact carried out in all activities of the Canadian forces.

The minister is further reviewing Canadian forces recruitment policies to ensure that applicants are deliberately asked about membership in racist organizations. Certain instances, as the hon. member has noted, have raised broad concerns over the suitability of the Canadian forces stationed in Somalia.

Mindful of her responsibility, the Minister of National Defence sought advice on how best to address the variety of concerns raised and directed the chief of defence staff to convene a board of inquiry.

The Minister of National Defence provided leadership, amending military regulations in order to ensure that civilians will sit on the board and undertaking an effective and timely investigation. The Minister of National Defence instituted this board to investigate the leadership, discipline, operations, actions and procedures of the Canadian Airborne Regiment Battle Group.

The terms of reference of the board of inquiry include the examination of the selection and screening process of the personnel on such missions. In addition the board will investigate the extent, if any, to which cultural differences, including racism, affected the conduct of the operations.

I would like to remind the hon. member that the Minister of National Defence has deep concerns over the subject he has raised. I thank him for raising it.

Adjournment Debate

STUDENT AID

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, it was on March 15 that I raised a question with respect to student aid programs.

Basically what I was saying is that this government has promised year after year that it would bring forth a student aid program that would genuinely, legitimately and with common sense respond to the needs of Canadians who want to upgrade, who want to go to college or university and get an education so that they can contribute to increase productivity in this nation and ensure that their potential is realized.

Year after year, and by three or four ministers, the promise continues to be made. On that particular day I pointed out to the government that all it has done is tinker with the program. However, in tinkering with the program it has hurt students.

What has it done? It has added a 3 per cent tax on student loans, on students who need to borrow and are therefore the poorest of the poor. While at one time students had a reprieve of six months now they have to pay six months more interest.

What else has it done? Now it would appear that it has decided to go to banks so that banks will loan students money. That in itself may be reasonable but we do not have the details. What will be the criteria governing the banks' decisions to grant or not grant a loan? Will the students be involved in drafting those criteria, in determining what they might be? There was no response, nothing, absolutely nothing.

• (1745)

This government has promised to bring forward a student aid program year after year. It is now three or four ministers later, we are near the end of a session and going into an election and yet there is nothing but penalties to the students. There is 3 per cent tax on student loans, six months more interest and some arrangement with the banks that we will know nothing about.

In my riding one of the issues that consistently comes up is the difficulties the students are having. Students are often harassed because they have not been able to pay their loans and yet there are no jobs or very poorly remunerated short-term jobs.

I remember one incident in which a young woman could not complete her education for a very good reason and had to get social assistance, and the government cut her off from getting further loans. I was able to intervene and with some good common sense the minister came

forward with the loan. That young woman has now graduated with a degree and she can now start repaying that loan and contribute significantly to society and to her family.

It is really unfortunate because the government has been doing things with the student aid program that go contrary to its basic concepts of increasing productivity and efficiency.

[*Translation*]

I think it is most unfortunate. I hope the government will finally come up with a plan that will meet the needs of students across Canada.

[*English*]

Mr. Ken James (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the questions raised by the hon. member for St. Boniface which he first raised in this House on March 15.

The government is committed to reforming the Canada Student Loans Program with the aim of improving assistance for needy students while at the same time ensuring value for money for our taxpayers. The key to this reform will be the new financing arrangements for the program based on lender risk sharing. The central objective of the program, to provide financial assistance to needy students for the pursuit of post-secondary studies, will not only continue in the new arrangements but will be strengthened.

The hon. member has suggested that the new financing structure is a first step to privatization. This ignores the fact that the government has always used private sector capital to finance student loans. The new financing structure will provide for reasonable costs for borrowers in repayment and reduce the cost to taxpayers of the existing program.

I should remind the hon. member that under the current program the federal government guarantees 100 per cent of each loan. In the event of a default lenders have little incentive to apply the same level of diligence in servicing and collecting the student loans as they do with their own loans. This is inconsistent with other federal loan guarantee programs.

During a meeting of the National Advisory Group on Student Financial Assistance on June 2, 1993 the Secretary of State confirmed that under the new arrangements lenders will continue to make loans to all eligible students, except in the case of credit abuse. Lenders will be required by the terms of the contract to make loans available to needy students, the majority of whom have no credit history, security or co-signatory.

The introduction of lender risk-sharing in the new arrangements is expected to lower the over-all costs of the program and provide scope for the government to increase the assistance to individual students who may not be able to be served now. I thank the hon. member for raising this question.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing): Mr. Speaker, on March 18 I raised a question with the Prime Minister about the implications of federal off-loading on to the province of Saskatchewan, that is the reduction in transfers to the province of Saskatchewan and the impact on that province's debt picture.

Off-loading is the deliberate effort by this federal government to reduce its own costs by passing on the costs of programming to provincial governments. It occurs in a number of different forms, reducing or eliminating federal transfers, such as the ceiling on equalization payments, limiting the growth rate of federal contributions to levels below the growth in the cost of providing those services. For example, there is the freeze on established programs funding transfers for health and post-secondary education, the young offenders agreement, manpower and labour force training. It is also imposing new conditions on federal programs which impact on provincial program costs, for example unemployment insurance changes, or the withdrawal from the provision of services for which a need exists and the public expectation of continuance is being created, for example programs for aboriginal people and agricultural support payments.

• (1750)

The implications ever since the mid-1970s, first under the Liberals and then under the Conservatives, have been dramatic for the province of Saskatchewan. The total off-loading in 1992-1993 of $538 million is a little more than the deficit of the province of Saskatchewan. The recent economic statements of the Minister of

Finance and particularly the one in December 1992 will add millions of dollars more to this cost.

The province has a number of very difficult choices to make in consequence. It could reduce the programs and services for which Ottawa has reduced its contributions, or raise provincial taxes to make up for those reductions, or allow the provincial deficit to rise, or some combination of these options. However this puts pressure on local governments and others that depend on provincial financial support.

To illustrate the impact of this off-loading, its cost to the province is more than the entire receipts from provincial sales tax or about half of the estimated receipts from personal income tax.

Social service expenditures for those in need could more than double had it not been for federal off-loading. The impact of the off-loading has grown over the past decade and will continue to grow in the years ahead, in particular as provinces face extras burdens because of the increased health and education costs.

This has generated in Saskatchewan and other provincial governments an unfair burden, an unfair sharing of federal restraint. In particular it is unfair because 40 per cent of expected total federal savings from its expenditure control plan in 1991—and the numbers are not very much different for other years—40 per cent is comprised of reductions in federal transfers to the provinces. Transfers themselves only account for 20 per cent of the total federal program spending. This is a very hard blow to provincial budgets because of the concentration on the transfers to the provinces.

It is essential if we are going to maintain adequate social programs with national standards such as health care that there be adequate financial support from the federal government. The total cutbacks in Saskatchewan are in the order of $538 million, $247.9 million in losses to health care and post-secondary education, and $215 million in losses to agriculture programs.

The burden of agriculture support used to rest 100 per cent on the federal government. That has been shifted so that $215 million more a year has to be paid by the province of Saskatchewan. Seventy-five million dollars has been added to the burden on a whole range of other issues, bringing the total to $538 million in 1992-1993 alone. In total from 1977-1978 when the Liberals began this trend to 1992-1993 the total is $1.2 billion taken out of the revenues available to Saskatchewan.

What we need is some co-operation, some work together in the solution of these problems, not off-loading, not sending the burden off to the provinces.

Mr. Ken James (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in response to the hon. member for Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing, the federal government provides over $40 billion in financial support to provincial governments. Most of that support is delivered through the three major transfer programs.

Established Programs Financing, or EPF, provides provinces with financial support in respect of health and post-secondary education. EPF is provided to all provinces on an equal per capita basis, and currently increases with population. EPF transfers are expected to total over $21 billion in 1993-1994.

Equalization which will exceed $8 billion in 1993-1994 increases the fiscal capacity of the poorer provinces. It makes it possible for all provinces to provide reasonably comparable public services at reasonably comparable levels of taxation.

Under the Canada Assistance Plan, or CAP, the federal government helps all provinces finance social assistance benefits on a 50-50 basis. These transfers then are based on eligible provincial spending and are now approaching $8 billion.

Since 1984 the federal program spending has been restrained in order to reduce, as the member says, the federal deficit. Transfers to provinces have shared in that restraint but not to the same extent as the federal program spending.

As the member would know, between 1984-85 and 1993-94 major federal transfers are expected to grow about 56 per cent. This represents an average annual increase of 5.1 per cent. By comparison, total federal government spending will grow far less rapidly in the same period at an annual rate of only 3.6 per cent. Therefore these are certainly things that the member should take into consideration.

Certainly fiscal responsibility is needed to ensure that in the long term the government can continue to afford supporting national programs and services vital to Canadians. If the deficit were allowed to grow then education, welfare and health expenditures would be crowded out by an ever increasing debt.

These are the reasons why we must look at transfer payments and continue to be diligent in working with the provinces.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Foster): The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at ten o'clock a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

The House adjourned at 5.56 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, June 8, 1993

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

HEALTH AND WELFARE, SOCIAL AFFAIRS, SENIORS AND THE STATUS OF WOMEN

EIGHTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Ms. Barbara Greene (Don Valley North): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present the eighth report of the Standing Committee on Health and Welfare, Social Affairs, Seniors and the Status of Women, *Toward 2000, Eliminating Child Poverty* relating the characteristics associated with poor households in Canada.

The committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to the report within 150 days.

* * *

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

FIFTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Larry Schneider (Regina—Wascana): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the fifth report of the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs. Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response within 150 days.

I have one or two brief comments I would like to make. Not only is this report in our two official languages but inasmuch as we are dealing with the livelihood of peoples who likely cannot read either language we have prepared the report in three other languages that are prevalent in aboriginal communities. These are Cree, Inuvialuit and Inuktitut.

We hope that through the translation, we are providing the essence of this report which was prepared and unanimously supported by the aboriginal affairs committee for submission to Parliament. We hope that our second effort at this will ensure a continued livelihood in the fur business for four of Canada's aboriginal peoples who so much depend on it for self-sufficiency.

[*Editor's Note: See today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

* * *

FULL EMPLOYMENT ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-444, an act to provide for full employment in Canada.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 68(2), the motion is deemed adopted.

Ms. McLaughlin: Madam Speaker, I am proud to have the opportunity to introduce my private member's bill entitled an act to provide for full employment in Canada.

This legislation recognizes that high unemployment is an unacceptable waste of both human potential and economic capital. It also recognizes that full employment must be the primary goal of all economic and fiscal policies of the federal government.

This is the surest way to finally end double digit unemployment and poverty and afford Canadian women and men the chance and the dignity of making a living in all regions of the country. Canada works when Canadians work.

• (1005)

[*Translation*]

This bill is not merely political porturing. It also contains an implementation clause. The bill provides that the Minister of Labour shall prepare a preliminary implementation plan for full employment in Canada and table it in Parliament. The plan will be subject to an annual review, in terms of the objectives to be set for achieving full employment, and a report on the adjustments required to meet the plan's objectives will be

prepared within six months after the end of the year and tabled in Parliament.

• (1010)

Madam Deputy Speaker: Ms. McLaughlin moves that the bill be now read the first time and printed.

Pursuant to Standing Order 69(1), the motion is deemed adopted.

Bill read the first time and printed.

* * *

BIAS INCIDENTS STATISTICS ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

Mrs. Shirley Maheu (Saint-Laurent—Cartierville) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-445, an Act to provide for the collection of statistics respecting incidents investigated by police forces where those incidents manifest evidence of bias against certain identifiable groups.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 68(2), the motion is deemed adopted.

[*English*]

Mrs. Maheu: Madam Speaker, I have the honour to introduce this bill that would establish a national bias crime registry. The absence of such a registry has in my view hindered our effectiveness at combating hate and bias crime.

The establishment of a hate crimes registry will shine a spotlight on this issue and enable all officials to look at how various communities have been targeted, whether by individual or organized acts of bias crime.

[*Translation*]

It is a matter of physical and mental security. Canadians have the right to know whether their government will deal with the problem of hate crimes. I believe that without the information such a registry would provide, any efforts to fight hate crimes will not be very effective. Governments must have adequate annual statistics to be able to take vigorous action.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Mrs. Maheu moves that the bill be now read the first time and printed.

Pursuant to Standing Order 69(1), the motion is deemed adopted.

Bill read the first time and printed.

* * *

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURE TO AMEND

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-446, an act to amend the Criminal Code (defamatory libel).

Madam Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 68(2), the motion is deemed adopted.

Mr. Hawkes: Madam Speaker, this is my first attempt at a private member's bill that deals with something that arose in my life prior to politics.

It is a tendency of the media from time to time to be in such a hurry to be first with a story that they ignore the responsibility side of the freedom which our society provides them.

This bill would add to section 300 of the Criminal Code the provision that everyone who publishes defamatory libel that he knows is false or, and this is the addition, with a reckless disregard for its truth is guilty of an indictable offence.

All we are asking with this legislation is that reporters and journalists, those who publish, make an honest effort to determine whether what they are publishing is true.

We have a second section in this bill which states that if they have made a mistake and then make a very vigorous and sensible effort to correct it, not simply by putting the correction on the back page somewhere but by giving it prominence and making an effort to correct what they did to cause the damage in the first place, there can be a mitigation of sentence.

I draw this to the attention of the House. In particular I draw it to the attention of those who own and publish periodicals and other media. The time has come in society where a greater effort needs to be made to publish the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

[*Translation*]

Madam Deputy Speaker: Mr. Hawkes moves that the bill be now read the first time and printed.

Pursuant to Standing Order 69(1), the motion is deemed adopted.

Bill read the first time and printed.

* * *

• (1015)

[*English*]

PETITIONS

SERIAL KILLER BOARD GAMES

Hon. Ralph Ferguson (Lambton—Middlesex): Madam Speaker, I rise today under Standing Order 36 to present petitions signed by people from southwestern Ontario, from Dutton, West Lorne, Fingal, Rodney, Springfield, Sarnia, Chatham and my own constituency and the village of Wardsville.

The petition calls on the government to the ban a board game being introduced into Canada called serial killer board game, number one edition, and the importation of serial killer cards.

Parents and grandparents strongly object to this game being allowed into Canada. The board game comes complete with a body bag, 25 babies and four serial killer figures. The object of the game is to commit murder and the person with the highest body count is the winner.

This ghoulish game is not in the best interests of children or Canadians of any age. The cards glamorize individuals who have wounded, raped and killed many people.

These petitioners humbly pray and call upon this House and Parliament to urge the Government of Canada to ban the sale of the serial killer board game and serial killer cards and any other such games, cards or materials made available in Canada in order to protect innocent children and Canadian citizens from violence.

CHILD CARE

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, in this first instance I have petitioners who point out that in receipted day care there are deductions for those who use that type of child care while there is no comparable deduction for those parents who choose to stay at home to raise their children. They feel this is an unfair situation which they would like corrected.

They also point out that there are too many programs in the taxation system that lead to real confusion and they call on the government to simplify the rules and regulations and the programs.

This second group of petitioners ask that deductions for child care be deductible from income for those families with special needs children, and especially for single parent families with special needs children.

They point out that some children require special facilities and services which are extremely costly. They believe that the current laws are unfair, insensitive and discriminatory and that they must be reviewed.

TAXATION

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface): This third instance, Madam Speaker, we have petitioners who want a simplification of the language of taxation. They also believe that unemployed workers, workers who are receiving workers' compensation and others who require child care so that they can go to interviews, take training programs, et cetera, should be permitted to do so.

They ask for the elimination of the goods and services tax. They ask for the promotion of the $1,000 interest and investment income deduction to encourage Canadians to bring investment back to Canada. They want an allowance of tax deductions for individuals who work on commission who must purchase their uniforms and/or tools for their employment. They want a cessation of tax loopholes which benefit the wealthy and large corporations, notably deferrals for private family trusts, business and entertainment exemptions, et cetera.

Finally, they want implementation of tax credits which would assist individuals with no or low incomes for the purchase of pharmaceutical drugs for seniors and education expenses for students.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. Al Horning (Okanagan Centre): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to present five petitions with 167 names from Gordon Grant, Gary Lohmeier, Roy George, Gordon Wright and Jack and Mary Cardiff on behalf of a group of constituents of mine who humbly call upon Parliament to enact legislation which will allow a referendum of the people binding upon Parliament to accept

or reject the two official languages, English and French, for the government and people of Canada.

NORTH AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. Jack Whittaker (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt): Madam Speaker, I have two petitions to present this morning. The first I wish to present pursuant to Standing Order 36 is one in which people throughout my riding, from Grand Forks to Westbridge to Beaverdell, have expressed concern over the proposed North American free trade agreement.

They suggest that the North American free trade agreement cannot be remedied through renegotiation and they call upon the House to reject the proposed North American free trade agreement and to recommend to the government that it use the termination clause to end the U.S.-Canada free trade agreement.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. Jack Whittaker (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt): Madam Speaker, it is my duty to present this petition sent to me by Mr. Donald Deprose of Penticton, British Columbia in which the petitioners call upon Parliament to enact legislation providing for a referendum of the people binding upon Parliament to accept or reject two official languages, English and French, for the government and the people of Canada.

• (1020)

CHILD SUPPORT PAYMENTS

Ms. Joy Langan (Mission—Coquitlam): Madam Speaker, it is my privilege on behalf of my constituents to present two petitions under Standing Order 36.

The first petition requests that the minister responsible act immediately to correct the inequity of non-custodial parents in Canada who are allowed an income tax deduction for child support payments while custodial parents are not allowed a similar deduction for their financial contributions to child rearing.

The petitioners point out that custodial parents must pay income tax on child support payments received from non-custodial parents. Therefore they request that this inequity be treated by the minister responsible to ensure that the child support contributions of both custodial and non-custodial parents be equal for tax purposes.

CANADA LABOUR CODE

Ms. Joy Langan (Mission—Coquitlam): Madam Speaker, my other petition is from persons who feel very strongly that the Canada Labour Code does not contain any limitations on the ability of employers to continue operating with replacement workers during a strike or lockout.

The petitioners cite the lockout of Nationair's 450 flight attendants which started in 1991 as an example of unnecessary picket line violence and confrontation taking place in the absence of such anti-scab legislation.

They therefore urge Parliament to amend the Canada Labour Code to prohibit the use of replacement workers by employers during a strike or lockout in the federal jurisdiction, as Quebec, Ontario and British Columbia have.

WATER EXPORTS

Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (Okanagan—Shuswap): Madam Speaker, I have a number of petitions.

A number of people in the riding of Okanagan—Shuswap as well as people throughout British Columbia are very concerned about the intention to dam the North Thompson River at Valemount, British Columbia and the sale of that water to San Diego and other California markets.

The petitioners ask the government to state categorically that it will not permit our fresh waters to be dammed and diverted to the U.S.A. and to state that our Canadian rivers are not for sale.

On behalf of residents throughout British Columbia I submit those petitions.

NORTH AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (Okanagan—Shuswap): Madam Speaker, this group of petitions concerns the proposed North American trade agreement.

It has resulted in even greater trade concessions being demanded of Canada. In particular, the new generic versions of brand name drugs will no longer be allowed

on the market during the 20-year monopoly on the drug pricing for each.

The petitioners ask the House and this government to reject the proposed North American trade agreement and to recommend to the government that it use the termination clause to end the Canada-U.S. trade agreement.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (Okanagan—Shuswap): Madam Speaker, my last petition is with respect to the actions of the government.

These citizens are concerned about and fear that the government has disenfranchised the people of Canada with respect to official languages.

They ask that a referendum of the people be held to accept or reject the two official languages policy that is currently in place for the Government of Canada.

WATER EXPORTS

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops): Madam Speaker, it is an honour to present a group of petitions from residents of Squilax, Salmon Arm, Celista, Anglemont, Chase, Vancouver, Seymour Arm, Little Fort, Heffley Creek, Kelowna, Forest Grove, Lac des Roches, Edmonton, Kamloops and a number of other smaller communities.

They like others earlier today have indicated their opposition to any possibility of the interbasin transfer of water for export.

The petitioners urge the Government of Canada to pass the bill recently introduced in the House that would prohibit interbasin transfer of water for export purposes.

IMMIGRATION ACT

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops): Madam Speaker, I have another petition signed by a number of residents of the Indo-Canadian community in Kamloops who point out that there have been changes to section 6 of the Immigration Act which includes the family class for immigration purposes.

They point out that this will set up barriers to family reunification, particularly for young women who traditionally remain dependent on their parents until they marry in India.

• (1025)

The petitioners are simply asking Parliament to re-examine that section of the Immigration Act to ensure that it does not prohibit the reunification of Indo-Canadian families, as well as others of course.

YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT

Mr. Brian O'Kurley (Elk Island): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 I have the honour to present two petitions including the names of hundreds of people from the riding of Elk Island and elsewhere.

The first petition asks Parliament to strengthen or replace the Young Offenders Act with legislation that would be a stronger deterrent to youth crime.

These petitioners are concerned mostly with repeat violent young offenders and they recommend that there be harsher penalties including work camps. In cases dealing with theft or property damage they suggest financial repayment to the victims of crime.

CHILD POVERTY

Mr. Brian O'Kurley (Elk Island): Madam Speaker, the second petition that I am presenting today deals with child poverty.

A number of petitioners from Fort Saskatchewan and elsewhere ask Parliament to take the actions necessary to reaffirm its commitment to seek the elimination of poverty among children in Canada by the year 2000 and to develop a plan for the implementation of this commitment.

JUSTICE

Ms. Beth Phinney (Hamilton Mountain): Madam Speaker, I have the pleasure today to present over 100,000 signatures on petitions to add to the almost two million signatures that have already been presented in the House by various members and parties.

These petitioners feel that there are still serious deficiencies in the criminal justice system of Canada. They ask that Parliament recognize that crimes of violence against the person are serious and abhorrent in our society.

These petitioners ask the government to amend the Criminal Code of Canada, the Bail Reform Act 1972, and the Parole Act accordingly.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. Bob Porter (Medicine Hat): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition that has been certified by the clerk pursuant to Standing Order 36.

This petition includes the signatures of some of my constituents in the riding of Medicine Hat. The petition calls on the Government of Canada to enact legislation providing for a referendum of the people, binding upon Parliament, to accept or reject two official languages, English and French, for the government and the people of Canada.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. Charles A. Langlois (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and to Minister of National Defence): Madam Speaker, if Questions Nos. 496 and 509 could be made Orders for Returns, those returns would be tabled immediately.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that Questions Nos. 496 and 509 be deemed to have been made Orders for Returns?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Text*]

Question No. 496—**Mr. Harvey (Edmonton East):**

For each fiscal year since 1985 did the government retain the services of private law firms in Edmonton and, if so, in each case, (*a*) what was the name of the firm, (*b*) what amount was received?

Return tabled.

Question No. 509—**Mr. Harvey (Edmonton East):**

For each year since 1985 did the government retain the services of private law firms in Calgary and, if so, in each case, (*a*) what was the name of the firm (*b*) what amount was received?

Return tabled.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Langlois: Madam Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT

ALLOCATION OF TIME TO CONSIDER REPORT AND THIRD READING STAGES OF BILL C-62

Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of Communications): Madam Speaker, I move pursuant to Standing Order 78(3):

That, in relation to Bill C-62, an act respecting telecommunications, not more than one further sitting day shall be allotted to the consideration of report stage and one sitting day to the consideration of the third reading stage of the bill; and

That, 15 minutes before the expiry of the time provided for Government Orders on the day allotted to the report stage consideration and on the day allotted to the third reading stage consideration of the said bill, any proceedings before the House shall be interrupted, if required, for the purpose of this order and, in turn, every question necessary to dispose of the stage of the bill then under consideration shall be put forthwith and successively, without further debate or amendment.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

Madam Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Madam Deputy Speaker: Call in the members.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 508*)

YEAS

Members

Anderson	Andre
Atkinson	Attewell
Beatty	Belsher
Bernier	Bertrand

Bjornson	Blais
Blenkarn	Bosley
Bouchard (Roberval)	Brightwell
Browes	Cadieux
Chadwick	Chartrand
Clark (Yellowhead)	Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Clifford	Cole
Corbeil	Corbett
Côté	Couture
Crosby (Halifax West)	Danis
Darling	DeBlois
de Cotret	Della Noce
Desjardins	Dobbie
Domm	Dorin
Duplessis	Epp
Fee	Feltham
Ferland	Fontaine
Friesen	Gibeau
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Greene
Guilbault	Halliday
Harvey (Chicoutimi)	Hawkes
Hicks	Hockin
Hogue	Holtmann
Horner	Horning
Hughes	James
Jelinek	Johnson
Joncas	Jourdenais
Kempling	Koury
Landry	Langlois
Loiselle	MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacDougall (Timiskaming—French River)	MacKay
Malone	Martin (Lincoln)
Masse	Mazankowski
McCreath	McDermid
McDougall (St. Paul's)	McLean
Merrithew	Mitges
Monteith	Moore
Nicholson	Oberle
O'Kurley	Plourde
Pronovost	Redway
Reimer	Ricard
Richardson	Roy-Arcelin
Saint-Julien	Schneider
Shields	Siddon
Sobeski	Soetens
Sparrow	Stevenson
Tardif	Tétreault
Thacker	Thompson
Thorkelson	Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Tremblay (Lotbinière)	Turner (Halton—Peel)
Valcourt	Van De Walle
Vankoughnet	Vézina
Vien	Vincent
Wilbee	
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)	Winegard
	Worthy—118

NAYS

Members

Allmand	Althouse
Assad	Baker
Bélair	Bellemare
Benjamin	Berger
Black	Bouchard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Boudria	Breaugh
Butland	Catterall
Clancy	Crawford
Duceppe	Duhamel
Ferguson	Finestone
Flis	Fontana
Foster	Fulton
Gauthier	Grey (Beaver River)
Harb	Harvard
Heap	Hovdebo
Jordan	Kaplan
Karpoff	Keyes
Kindy	Kristiansen
Langan (Mission—Coquitlam)	Langdon (Essex—Windsor)
Lee	MacWilliam
Manley	Marleau
Mifflin	Milliken
Nault	Nowlan
Nystrom	Parker
Peterson	Phinney
Proud	Rideout
Riis	Rompkey
Speller	Stewart
Tremblay (Rosemont)	Wappel
Whittaker	Young (Acadie—Bathurst)—60

PAIRED MEMBERS

nil/aucun

• (1110)

[*Translation*]

Madam Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed, from Tuesday, June 1, consideration of Bill C-62, an act respecting telecommunications, as reported (with amendments) from a subcommittee of the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture; and Motions Nos. 6, 7, 8, 10 and 11.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): When the debate on Bill C-62 was suspended we were considering Motions Nos. 6, 7, 8, 10 and 11, and the hon. member for Mount Royal had up to eight minutes left to speak. The hon. member for Mount Royal has the floor.

[*English*]

Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal): Mr. Speaker, I was in the process of looking at the amendments to clause 7 of this telecommunications bill. This clause is basically the heart of this government's concepts and design for the telecommunications industry across this land.

I think that the members of the Liberal Party who were sitting at that committee, as well as the other opposition party, were very effective in bringing about changes to the government's legislation. I outlined at the outset that the procedure was most unique.

Although I would like to pursue the changes that are being recommended to clause 7, I find totally unacceptable the minister's lack of candour, his laying the blame elsewhere rather than on himself, on his ministry, and on

the front bench of this government. The cabinet obviously did not see the same importance in the telecommunications legislation as the minister seemed to and as the industry certainly indicated.

Rather than pushing on his own House leader and rather than being candid and forthright with this industry the minister decided to make some public statements indicating that this bill was being blocked by the opposition parties in filibustering his wonderful bill that he had not even created in the first place and in which he wimped out on some very significant matters within this bill.

He walked into this House after having given a press conference and I quote what he said according to the media:

> The federal government will have to strong-arm the opposition to get the bill through the House. It's clear what we're dealing with here is a filibuster. The only way for this to go through is to call time allocation which limits debate on the bill.

That is what the Minister of Communications said to the media as quoted by Jill Vardy in *The Financial Post*.

• (1115)

The reality of the situation is that this government did not pay very much attention to this bill. It certainly was never on the front burner, although in the glorious rhetoric of the Prime Minister it was one of the things that he mentioned in the 1984 Speech from the Throne.

It was the first issue that came to attention in the document and budget of the now Minister for International Trade and the then Minister of Finance. It sat on the back burner until there was a memorandum of understanding in which the then minister, Flora MacDonald, issued defining type one and type two telecommunications structure. That was in July 1987 just prior to the free trade agreement.

On February 7, 1992 after having waited nine years for this government to act on telecommunications—

An hon. member: A lot of years.

Mrs. Finestone: That is right. Nine whole years for this government to act on telecommunications.

The government finally brought in this bill at the beginning of February 1992. Then this bill sat on the back burner for another year, never even getting to the House for second reading until April 19, 1993.

It finally got reported to this House on May 28 after it had been sent to committee. It had exactly two weeks in committee, one week of which was the Easter break. The government says we are responsible for this government's poor agenda in getting it in here at that time.

Clause by clause started on May 11 and we had two sessions on that day. As I say the House then closed on May 17. We came back, we had two and one-half sitting days to address this bill and it was reported after a late Thursday night session on Friday morning to this House. We started June 1 to debate it here.

This minister has not been able to get his House leader to put it on the debating agenda. He would have had to mix the pot, get in touch with the constituents and tell them to raise a big fuss. Well thank goodness they raised a fuss because otherwise this minister would not have the bill moved past square one.

I want to say to this minister:

[*Translation*]

You are to blame. I must say to him that he is to blame as well as his government if the industry does not welcome the bill as he would like. He must go to the Senate when the debate in the House is over.

[*English*]

They have called closure time and time again on everything else. I think this now comes to 23 times this government has called closure. Certainly I know I have counted up to 19 or 20 times.

How do we have a normal debate? How do we have constructive changes made? With co-operation on both sides of the House, which I had presumed there was. I was prepared to say to this minister: "You really allowed a better process in committee. You did not use the legislative committee format. You used a subcommittee of the standing committee and we were able to improve this bill most significantly".

But no, he had to become a mean person, mean and lily-livered in many ways. I feel very sorry for him for the way he has conducted himself in this particular instance.

An hon. member: A shameful display.

Mrs. Finestone: The delay has been on the government side, certainly not on this side of the debating chamber, this side of the two foils which I think would have been very apt at this time.

With respect to the changes that were brought about here, I just want to touch on an amendment brought in by my colleague from the NDP which relates to the changes under privacy.

Even to getting the privacy matter right, this minister did not get his act together to put a bill together that reflects convergence and how telephony will be linked to the whole cable network, to the whole cable system, to what was happening out there to the world yesterday, never mind today and tomorrow.

We are going to need a bill that is going to bridge the broadcast bill and this telecommunications bill. On the privacy side there is very little that has been done in this bill. The government had to bring another bill in first to tinker with and make this public relations undertaking that we care about privacy.

• (1120)

Therefore we brought in a bill on cellular telephones which are really not telephones but radios. They should have been incorporated as part of this bill, but because there seemed to be some ministerial thought that this would have better PR focus he put it somewhere else.

I think it is important for the bill to go through. I indicated that to the industry from square one. It is unconscionable and a sad moment that the minister and his staff, along with the government and its cabinet, do not know how to take full responsibility. They love to lay the blame somewhere else: "You made us do it". How sad. I think I will get them big boxes of Kleenex.

Ms. Joy Langan (Mission—Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, it is interesting the hon. member for Mount Royal says that it is important the bill go through. We share that view, but we believe very strongly that the bill should only go through if it is markedly strengthened. That is the thrust behind the amendments put forward by my colleague, the hon. member for Okanagan—Shuswap.

The hon. member for Mount Royal also talked about the press report that the minister would have to bring the big hammer into the House to ensure that the bill goes through because members of Parliament on this side were filibustering. It has been a long time since the House saw a filibuster. From the time this Parliament began in 1988 it has not been possible to have a filibuster in the House.

If it looks like the debate is getting a bit feisty, a bit meaningful and a bit interesting, the government moves closure yet again so it can ram through its legislation and ensure that meaningful discussion does not take place.

To have the minister reporting to the press that he will have to use the big hammer on the opposition because we are delaying this bill or any other bill in the House is insulting at its very best. The minister could at least have respect for the House by looking a bit embarrassed by those kinds of statements.

With regard to the amendments in Motions Nos. 6, 7, 8, 10 and 11 it is important to look at the five amendments to the clause as objectives for the telecommunications industry. The first amendment would ensure that the telecommunications infrastructure is used to improve and express Canada's cultural identity.

The government failed to define the imminent convergence between telecommunications carriers and broadcasters. It has produced a visionless entrenchment of the *status quo*.

Cultural groups across the country are outraged that culture has been expunged from the objectives of the bill. Keith Kelly, national director of the Canadian Conference of the Arts, said: "We need to bring telecommunications into the cultural realm and to recognize its increasing importance in the production and delivery of cultural products".

There is no reference in the bill to any responsibility of the telecommunications industry to further the federal government's cultural objectives. The hon. minister is gazing at the ceiling. I might be boring him. These are important points. If the government were to take the opposition as seriously as it takes its friends in the telecommunications industry, we might end up with a good bill.

Multinational businesses are already exploiting telecommunications to circumvent Canadian rules intended to protect and promote culture. *Sports Illustrated* is publishing a Canadian edition that has little Canadian content, but because it is being beamed across the border and printed in Canada there is nothing the federal government can do or will do. *Sports Illustrated* is only one example in the print media.

We in Vancouver enjoy *The Globe and Mail* because it is beamed across the country. There is nothing to stop a whole flood of American publications being printed in Canada and claiming to be Canadian products with Canadian content.

• (1125)

With the bill we have rigid rules for broadcasters to promote and protect Canadian content but no rules for telecommunication industries. I wonder whether the next step will be a change in broadcast policy so they can compete with telecommunications. Pretty soon we will have no rules. We will have deregulation for the entire broadcast-telecommunications sector. Is that the slippery slope this minister is taking us on?

It is important that just around the corner is the convergence of the broadcasting and telecommunications industries. The bill is silent on the issue. If this bill were passed into law, telecommunications companies would be exempt from the rules which apply to broadcasters to promote culture, but they could well be offering the same products as broadcasters.

The small omission in the bill may have huge ramifications. Ottawa will have relinquished any ability to promote Canadian culture in the future. One might ask why there has been such an omission. Was it to satisfy the needs of Quebec nationalists who argue that the federal government should relinquish all control over culture? It is important to take a look at what that means.

The Alliance of Canada Cinemas says: "Accepting a recommendation to delete references to sovereignty, politics and culture would ignore the long-term implications of convergence. It would be bowing to a deregulation fever that may be premature. Many issues relating to the transport of information through telecommunications pipelines remain unanswered, such as access by programming services and compensation for rights contained in material distributed. Moreover, we submit that those advocating the deletion of social and cultural clauses in this bill have a narrow view of the potential volume of information and business opportunities available. In short, they are not looking past their bottom line at the expense of the greater public interest".

We are here to be concerned about the greater public interest. We see deregulation in the industry again. The government has not learned from the deregulation of the airline industry, deregulation of the railroad industry, deregulation across the country.

Deregulation brings problems and the destruction of the Canadian milieu. It changes us into something other than what Canadians really believe we want to be, that is a united Canada, a Canada with an identity and a Canada we can all be proud of, not a 51st state.

Mr. Jack Whittaker (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt): Mr. Speaker, before I begin to speak on the amendments themselves I would like to draw the attention of the public to the fact that once again the government has used a form of closure or time allocation. It is something like the 47th time this has been used since 1988 when I was sent here by the constituents of Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt. It has been used in a manner that is totally shameless on the part of the government.

Every time there is cause for reasonable debate on a bill, every time there is something the people of Canada are interested in, every time there is something the people of Canada should be told about and there is a debate that should take place, this government has immediately marched in and cut off all meaningful debate.

The government has given little opportunity in most cases for any discussion, whether it be on the GST, the free trade agreement, the North American free trade agreement or major changes to the Unemployment Insurance Act. I could go on and on. It became so ridiculous, I recall, that two years ago the government brought in a time allocation motion on a bill that was uncontested by the opposition. It would not even talk to the opposition to know the bill it was putting before Parliament was uncontested.

Similarly we have the situation with the telecommunications bill, a bill that could substantially change the way we look into the future. With the major changes taking place in telecommunications technology it seems that

this is a time when we should be looking very carefully at a bill to take us into the 21st century.

• (1130)

Such a bill has been on the books for over four years and the government at the last minute brings in approximately 75 amendments at report stage. The minister will say there are only 53, but if we analyse it we see something like 75 amendments were brought in at the last minute that need careful scrutiny.

This bill was brought in and then gutted and regutted. What we are trying to do here is to include some semblance of reasonableness in the legislation before Parliament.

This particular grouping deals with the telecommunications area and the cultural industry. A semblance of reasonableness was put forward by the various groups that appeared before the legislative committee. They were concerned we were going into the 21st century looking at a changing industry and looking at technological changes that could forever harm the culture of the country. That culture has been slowly building over the past three centuries. It has been slowly building over the last 125 years of the Canadian entity. Now we see major changes occurring because of the telecommunications industry and technological changes.

The crux has to be that we must look at where we are going in the future. We have to look at the legislation before us to ensure there are safeguards for the cultural industry of Canada. We need to listen to the cultural industry within Canada to ensure we are using what it sees as the areas we should be going into and putting them into legislative changes.

After all, these groups have been fighting for their existence for a good number of years. They have been studying and living day to day with the reality that unless we move to ensure the technological industry and the telecommunications industry are looked after as they expand, they could be swept away under a barrage of new technology beaming in from other areas.

As my friend from Mission—Coquitlam has said, we are looking at a number of items. Quoting the Canadian Conference of the Arts, Keith Kelly says that we need to bring telecommunications into the cultural realm and to recognize its increasing importance in the production and delivery of cultural products.

That is a telling phrase. It is essential to the whole argument of where we are going in the future. We have to ensure that within the bill there is reference and provision made for a cultural entity within the telecommunications industry. We want to ensure the Canadian cultural identity is protected and promoted. Multinational businesses are already exploiting telecommunications to circumvent Canadian rules.

Let us look at Motion No. 7 which has been put forward by my friend from Okanagan—Shuswap. The motion ensures the primacy of affordable and reliable telecommunications. The objectives as currently set out in the legislation do not ensure that the provision of affordable telephone service is seen as a more important objective than the current objective to foster increased reliance on market forces. The amendment would ensure the provision of affordable and reliable service is first and foremost.

• (1135)

The government's dogmatic preference for competition for competition's sake has already cost my home province of British Columbia 820 jobs. That is a direct result of competition and deregulation.

The Public Interest Advocacy Centre states:

> PIAC continues to be concerned—by the apparent confusion between ends and means. Subsection 7(f) in particular, appears out of place, since it advocates a particular means of achieving the stated policy goals. If there is indeed a commitment to increase reliance on market forces for the provision of telecommunications services, then it belongs in a different category from the goals that it is intended to achieve.

I will now move on to Motion No. 8 to amend clause 7. This amendment would include a specific provision for consultation between federal and provincial governments to ensure that the national telecommunications policy promotes regional industrial development within the industry. Without this amendment there is no provision in the objectives to ensure consultation between the federal and provincial governments.

A representative of the Government of New Brunswick while appearing before the legislative committee stated:

> I suggest that section 7 be amended to include:

1) Consultations between the federal and provincial governments to guarantee that the national telecommunications policy promotes industrial development that will build on the strengths and potential of each province;

2) Requirements that the regulator be accessible and responsive to users and providers of telecommunications and services in the provinces.

The Government of New Brunswick wants and feels that there should be more consultation provincially and federally.

In wrapping up we have to look at the over-all protection, not just now but in the future, of our full cultural area within Canada and with each of the Canadian provinces and territories.

Ms. Mary Clancy (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, I am certainly happy that this bill has finally come to report stage. However there is a really very bizarre set of circumstances surrounding this.

This bill has been promised by every communications minister since 1984. In other words, we are looking at a nine-year delay from when this government came into office until now when this bill is actually on the verge of being passed.

Consequently I find it—the word amusing really pales in the circumstances—passing strange to read a quote from the Minister of Communications in today's *The Financial Post*. He states: "It is clear that what we are dealing with here is a filibuster", referring to the actions of the New Democratic Party. The article continues: "The only way for this to go through is by time allocation, said communications minister Perrin Beatty".

Really, for nine years the government has dawdled, hung around and done very little on this bill, even on the actual introduction of this bill. It was introduced in February 1992 and second reading did not take place until April 1993. This is hardly, if we are to follow the phrase of *operatio sequitur esse*, an example of a government with some kind of a plan that it set out to follow with any kind of alacrity, as I know my colleague from Kingston and the Islands would agree.

Now we are being told that the members of the New Democratic Party are filibustering. This is a situation in which if it walks like a duck and quacks like a duck, it is probably a duck, and this duck is extremely tardy in arriving at the duck pond.

When we look at the various objectives of this bill we have to say that the government has again laboured and brought forth a mouse. While the hon. members to my left do not need me to defend them I think that in particular this group of amendments is one that the government could bear looking at and learning from, although it is difficult to know whether the government does indeed learn.

It is a tired government, full of tired policies and I think most of us are very pleased that we are at the very least winding down, as my hon. colleague from Bonavista would agree, to the proper dénouement.

• (1140)

It is upsetting to see this action, to say the least, with regard to legislation that should be duly considered by the members of this House, the vast majority of whom have an interest in making their comments and speaking on behalf of their constituents, but in particular with regard to a bill that has allegedly been on the government's agenda for nine years.

Mr. Milliken: They are slow thinkers over there.

Ms. Clancy: Clearly they are extremely slow thinkers. This is a bill that has taken a year and four months to go from first reading to report stage. Now the government is hurling implications across the floor of the House of Commons and in the public press saying that the representatives of the people, whose right it is to want to debate these amendments fully and make some comment about the amendments this bill so desperately needs, are attempting to cause trouble and cause delay. There is really only one word to describe this kind of argument and obfuscation against the public. That word is silly.

An hon. member: No, it is not.

Ms. Clancy: Yes, my hon. friend from the other side, the word is silly. Every communications minister since 1984 has promised this bill. Finally we were given this bill, a year and four months ago, and now we have this incredible haste, this incredible rush. Maybe I am suspicious, although I am sure my colleagues on this side of the House would disagree with that. Maybe I am seeing things that I should not see, although it would be a first.

It seems to me that what the government wants to do is push this through, along with other pieces of legislation. If by some chance in the limited time available to us before this House rises and before this government, led by whomever, is forced to call an election and allow the

democratic process to take its well-deserved course, then it will stand in the public and say that it promised us this sort of legislation and that sort of legislation.

The government will say that it tried its very best to see that sort of legislation would come through but those terrible members of the opposition did not care what was in the best interest of Canadians. The government will say that because the opposition members wanted to stand up and debate these questions, as their constituents elected them to do, it consequently lost the opportunity to get this through.

We on this side of the House want to make it extremely clear to the people of Canada that is not what is going on here. This is a government that had nine full years to do something about this issue. Yet here we are, in the dying days of this Parliament, being forced to rush this along with a number of other bills of great import to the Canadian people. We are being forced to do it in a slapdash and haphazard manner.

The people of Canada deserve better. Very soon the people of Canada will have better.

Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to the procedural *faux pas* that I believe the government has committed in relation to this bill in applying time allocation at this stage on these proceedings. The minister will know that this was an entirely inappropriate move on the part of the government given the excellent co-operation that has occurred in this House for the last couple of weeks.

If he looks at the record, he will notice that yesterday four bills were passed in this House and Senate amendments to another were concurred in. The House finished its work on all those bills before the normal hour of adjournment. The minister and his cabinet colleagues received tremendous co-operation and they know it. We did so in spite of the fact that we could have spent at least a day debating every one of those bills and delaying and holding them up.

• (1145)

The minister has decided that more than two days of debats on this bill is too much and so the government has to silence the opposition. I know why the minister wants to silence the opposition. He does not like the arguments that are being made because we are pointing out too many problems with this legislation. He and his colleagues decided the best thing to do in the circumstances, notwithstanding the co-operation on other bills, was to force this one through so they could shut the opposition up.

Really it is quite unnecessary, and the minister and his cabinet colleagues know it, unless the minister has some hidden agenda to try to shut the House down early and avoid embarrassment to the new leader of the Conservative Party who could easily be humiliated by having to answer questions in the House.

We have all seen their weaknesses as leaders and we are aware they may have that difficulty. It may take them months to get up to steam to answer questions as a Prime Minister might be expected to answer in this House. We realize that. Perhaps that is really the reason for this, but if so let us have an honest statement that the leaders are incompetent and would be incapable of dealing properly with the House and get on with it. Let us not cover it up by using time allocation at this stage of the proceedings to try to jam things through.

We know that if the minister were running for the leadership and was expected to win we would not have this problem because he is capable of answering questions in the House, unlike some of his colleagues who are in the race. I do not want to discuss that for too long. He might change his mind even at this late date.

The debate on this bill has been exceedingly short. There was considerable time left after the debate on committee stage the other day when we could have gone on to discuss various chunks of the amendments. They are grouped for debate. We could have dealt with them in a more orderly fashion. However, with time allocation it makes it difficult because if the debate on one goes on too long then the others will not get debated at all. At the end of today we may find we have to vote on a series of amendments that have never been discussed because of time allocation. That is regrettable.

Today is also an important anniversary and I thought hon. members might want to observe it. Today is the 30th time in this Parliament that time allocation has been applied to government legislation. I am not counting closure. I am only counting the times that time allocation has been applied under Standing Order 78. This is the 30th such occasion in this Parliament. That is a record.

No other Parliament has suffered from the abuse of the time allocation rule the way this Parliament has.

The government is fond of saying it likes to make Parliament more efficient. It forgets that Parliament is a place for public debate and discussion. It absents itself from the House in large measure, and I congratulate the minister on being here today as it is unusual. By absenting itself and refusing to participate in public debate the government generally ignores the expressed intention and wishes of members of Parliament and carries on with its own legislation.

The result of that has been a disastrously low standing for the government in public opinion polls in this country. It is so much so that it is terrified to call an election, which it is its constitutional duty to do, because it knows that certain defeat awaits it at the polls.

We have had this prolonged delay and procrastination while the government persists in introducing unpopular measures in this House and ramming them through even though its mandate to do so has effectively gone.

We have lots of statements by ministers of the Crown in previous incarnations which indicate that they share my view that a government in the fifth year of its mandate has lost its mandate to govern and introduce substantial legislation.

I said that time allocation had been used 30 times in the House but it is important to bear in mind that today time allocation is being applied to two stages of this bill's progress at one time. It is being applied to the report stage of the bill and also to third reading of the bill.

I went back in my records and counted the use of time allocation and the number of stages of bills that had been affected by time allocation. If we count the two that happened today we are up to 49 various stages of bills that have been subject to time allocation on the 30 occasions on which it has been used in this Parliament alone.

The 30 uses of time allocation is itself a record and the 49 stages of the bills that have been affected by the use of time allocation must also be something of a record. Frankly it is a disgraceful record.

• (1150)

I think the government has shown a great lack of judgment in deciding to use time allocation. It is a self-fulfilling thing. Once one embarks on a course of using time allocation as a means of limiting debate one increases the temptation for an opposition to continue to talk to bring the government to a position where it must use it. Instead of saying that it would not use time allocation and try to bring an orderly end to debate by acceding to some of the demands of an opposition by making amendments to the legislation and being reasonable, the government digs in its heels and says no, it will make no changes to the legislation and we can talk as long as it will allow us to talk because it will cut us off with time allocation when the time comes.

The unfortunate fact is that by the use of this rule we have changed the nature of parliamentary debate, have limited the role of opposition and of course of backbench government members whose views are not solicited and are seldom heard in this House as we witnessed in this debate today. Very few are participating and will participate. Ministers take no interest in what members of Parliament say in respect of their bill because they do not want to admit that there is a flaw or that there is anything wrong. The importance therefore of parliamentary debate diminishes.

The government then says that since parliamentary debate is so unimportant it might as well cut it off with time allocation and the whole vicious circle continues. Public respect for the institution is diminished and the effectiveness of the institution is diminished. The ability of the government to give some credence to its legislation so that it receives public respect and acceptability is diminished. The public does not believe that it has any real input in the legislative process because its representatives in Parliament are ignored.

The government has embarked on this course. It has pursued it with vigour all in the name of efficiency. Of course we know what Tory efficiency is: agree with us or shut up. That is the effective rule of Tory efficiency. I regret that the government has taken this pugnacious and very hard-nosed attitude not just today, but 30 times during this Parliament and throughout its mandate for the last nine years. This government has been a disaster

for Canada and most Canadians know that. One only need look at the opinion polls to see that it is so.

The extraordinary thing that I could not help but notice as I read through a little article this morning in *Maclean's* magazine about the Conservative leadership convention that we all know is coming up this weekend is how many of the Conservative members of the party, the card-carrying Tories in this country, think the government's record is good. Every other opinion poll in the country indicates that Canadians think their record is a total disaster. The Conservatives must have chosen all their delegates out of that tiny percentage of Canadians who think the government is good because something like 70 per cent of them thought that this government had a good record. What distorted thinking must go on at these conventions.

I can only thank the heavens that I am not obliged to go to such a convention and listen to the trash that clearly will be spouted by the members at this meeting when they talk about the kind of nonsense that is portrayed in these polls wherein these people think the government record is good. I know you do not, Mr. Speaker, you are wiser than the majority of the people who are going to that convention and I can only offer to you, Sir, my deepest sympathy if in fact you are a delegate to that meeting.

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Saskatoon—Humboldt): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on this series of resolutions to make some comments in support of the resolutions by my colleague from Okanagan—Shuswap.

These amendments are aimed at making this bill a little more consumer friendly and a little more Canadian friendly. What needs to be done with this bill is to strengthen the relationship between the consumer, the provinces and the industry. A good portion of this industry has been developed by the provinces and is part of the provincial structure. It therefore becomes very important that the provinces and the consumers be involved and that we make this industry as Canadian friendly as possible. Instead, this movement toward competitiveness makes it probably more American friendly.

• (1155)

This series of amendments gives some vision to the industry. It puts in place some kind of vision of what the industry should be doing. What is more logical than the four or five amendments that have been placed here? For instance, what can be more logical than making one of the most important aims of the industry to be, as the motion states:

> "(b) to enhance the expression and communication of Canada's cultural identity."

What would be more logical than making that the basic aim of the industry? What can be more logical than maintaining an affordable system?

One of the real concerns all across the country has been that the whole of the communications industry is gradually becoming the area of those people who can afford it. I have a daughter, for instance, who told me the other day: "I am just not going to be able to afford a telephone very much longer".

This is not an unrealistic approach for a lot of people. When you are having trouble putting food on the table then communications, if they become expensive, become extra. That again is one of the amendments which my colleague has put forward.

Third, what can be more logical than having consultation with the provinces? After all, the basic industry has been developed by the provinces. In fact, as far as telephones are concerned I was a member of a telephone company that was a co-operative in Saskatchewan 45 or 50 years ago. It became part of the Saskatchewan telephone system and is now being threatened to some extent in the direction it is going in being available to people in my community.

Again, what can be more logical than to be sure by putting it into legislation that the provinces, the industry and the government consult before they take directions that are harmful to Canada generally and to the consumer specifically?

What can be more logical than to support and to encourage innovation and to make that a central point as far as the development of the industry is concerned? All of these are very specific and very small directions which would strengthen the bill that, as my colleagues suggested, has been around for 90 years.

I am very surprised that the minister said we in this corner are filibustering it when for nine years it could have been passed. The filibustering must have gone on within his caucus. That is where it has been held up for the last nine years.

Now when it is brought forward and we get a little debate on it, he shuts it down. The positions that Canadians right across the country have held for many years and have presented to us as their representatives should be put in. We would not have any trouble supporting this bill if the minister had taken the time to strengthen it in the directions which are indicated even in these first five motions.

There are five motions in this group aimed at making the bill more consumer friendly, more Canadian friendly. That is the direction we should be looking. It is the direction that we thought the government was looking but obviously it did not take the time to make the kinds of changes which would have made it Canadian and consumer friendly.

• (1200)

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to participate in the debate this afternoon, although I am a little disappointed in the government deciding that it ought to impose a form of closure on the debate at this stage. I think it is fair to say that there has been a tremendous amount of work go into this legislation.

I notice with interest that the government, in spite of the best interest of the drafters and the people who assembled the original legislation, felt that there was a whole set of areas that needed improvement. If my calculations are accurate I think that the government itself, or members of the government to be more specific, suggested 74 corrections to the legislation. That is a lot of corrections. It obviously reflected a set of concerns that the original drafters had not prepared for.

I have read with interest much of the work that was done in the Senate, I think for weeks on end in terms of pre-study, again identifying a number of areas of concern.

When my colleague from Okanagan—Shuswap introduced a set of amendments to improve the legislation, 34 to be specific, it was our effort to improve legislation that we felt in certain areas was seriously flawed. To generalize what these areas are, I think it is fair to say that all of those men and women who are employed in the telecommunications industry at a time of increasing deregulation are concerned about the future of their positions. They are concerned about whether they will be employed in the telecommunications industry in the years ahead.

I have had discussions with representatives of the TWU, a very proud collection of individual men and women who appreciate the fact that they and the companies that they work for, with their brothers and sisters, really represent a cutting edge of Canadian technology. Here is where Canada has led the way globally in technological innovations, showing the way in terms of the telecommunications sector. One of the areas of which we have all been exceedingly proud over the years is the role that Canada and this sector has played in the development of international initiatives in telecommunications.

When the people who are actually doing the work, the individual men and women involved, showed concern about their future in terms of employability, that led my colleague from Okanagan—Shuswap to bring forward an amendment that would in a sense say that while we welcome changes—as a matter of fact Canada has always welcomed changes and has done very well with these changes—we have some obligation in terms of the future of these employed people as well. To simply abandon people, as we would in this case, as an old pair of tires or a used battery and say that as far as we are concerned with this industry we could not care less about you and your family seems to be kind of a crass and unnecessarily insensitive approach which one would expect from an unfeeling government.

We put forward amendments that would provide a certain element of security for those individuals. That was simply not accepted.

In other areas, naturally we are concerned about the long-term implications of the telecommunications sector and the recent legislation passed in this House, the enabling legislation for the Mexico-U.S.-Canada trade deal. I think it is very obvious what direction we are taking as a country when it comes to NAFTA. I think there is no industry where this is more obvious than in the telecommunications sector.

• (1205)

One is very hesitant to predict the future but look at the way things are going with the Canada-U.S. trade deal. Plant after plant in Canada is closing down to take advantage of the lower labour rates in Tennessee, Louisiana, Texas and so on and to take advantage in many cases of right to work legislation. There are lower standards and regulations in terms of the environment and health and safety in the work place and so on. Investors and

entrepreneurs have taken advantage of this flexibility by moving their operations southward to take advantage of these conditions. Rather than proceed with an expansion of their existing operation they may have decided to expand their operations in that jurisdiction.

Now under the North American free trade agreement we are going to add Mexico to this equation so now people can actually take advantage not only of wage rates of $6, $7 or $8 an hour that we find in Mississippi, Louisiana or South Carolina, but one can move across the Rio Grande and take advantage of labour rates of 58 cents an hour.

I listened with interest the other night on CNN when ex-presidential candidate Ross Perot was being interviewed as probably one of the more successful business persons in the United States. The question was put to him of how he and his colleagues would react to NAFTA. He said that it was perfectly clear that most of the investors that he knows and most of the industry and business leaders of the United States will be inclined to move more and more of their operations into Mexico to take advantage of hourly wage rates of 58 cents and virtually a total abandonment of environmental and work place regulations.

That is not saying they do not exist on paper but they are simply not enforced to take advantage of a situation where if there is a union in a plant the union is controlled by the management and supported by the government in that respect.

Mr. Perot, if nothing else, is a very straightforward individual. He sees the world as a business person. His decision was that he could maximize his profits considerably or certainly more by moving his existing American operations into Mexico. He was very straightforward. He said that everybody he knows will probably be doing the same thing.

If it is attractive to move his operations from Tennessee to Mexico one can imagine how attractive it is to move operations from Toronto, Winnipeg, Vancouver, Halifax or wherever into Mexico in order to compete in the North American market where one can send one's finished products or services virtually across the continent free of tariffs or other non-tariff barriers.

I am going to make a prediction. I would say that within a short period of time when you, Mr. Speaker, or others dial an operator to get information for a particular number the voice you will hear at the other end of the telephone will sound more like *Buenos noches, senor*. In other words, the telephone operator will be operating out of Guadalajara, or out of Ensenada or out of a community along the Rio Grande River.

I say to those people who might scoff at this notion that if they were running a telecommunications company and were responsible for maximizing profits and could pay an operator $18 an hour in Canada, $12 an hour in the northern part of the United States, $7 an hour in the southern United States or 58 cents an hour in Mexico, where would they locate their operation?

An hon. member: Canada.

Mr. Riis: Some weird entrepreneur over here said Canada. Obviously he does not make much money.

The point is that it is obvious where the trend line will take us. That is why we on this side of the House say: For goodness' sake let us not rush this important piece of legislation through. Let us acknowledge the fact that this government is slowly dismantling any possibility we might have to influence the future for our children and our children's children. It is in a sense selling out to the sacred cow of the marketplace. This means that people in this country will not have jobs.

I think this House is concerned about that. I know people on this side of the House are concerned and that is why we are begging the minister to for goodness' sake please reconsider this idea of having closure motions before the House that will limit the debate and ensure that this legislation is wrapped up, signed, sealed and delivered in the next 48 hours.

We think it is wrong and that is why we are speaking so forcefully against this legislation at this point.

• (1210)

Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River): Mr. Speaker, I want to address a few remarks today with reference to both the government's attempt to impose

time allocation and some remarks in relation to this bill at report stage.

A number of speakers have noted, and I want to reinforce those notations, that this bill sat on the Order Paper for over a year before it made it back into this House a short time ago. It was very regrettable.

The government has shown us now that this bill is important enough to it and to Parliament and to Canadians to warrant the imposition of time allocation but it was not important enough a few months ago in terms of the cabinet table and the order of priorities that cabinet was attaching to the many pieces of legislation before this House. I suggest that signals and manifests a problem at the cabinet table. We will not have to worry about that for too much longer because this Parliament is coming to a close.

The same problem that existed with this bill in terms of it apparently not being important enough to do anything with it over the last year existed in other areas at the cabinet table. I point out the very important sentencing bill that was in the hands of the justice minister that sat around similarly for a year. It was introduced and sat for 11 months until about a month ago at which point, almost simultaneously with the communications minister here, the justice minister decided that we must get this bill through and pushed it through with a flurry of other legislation.

Fortunately due to the good sense of members on this side and on that side of the House that particular bill is not proceeding. It was flawed. It was a very important bill but because we did not have enough time to deal with it well the members on both sides of the House consensually agreed that the bill would not proceed.

I gather we have been waiting around for 75 to 80 years for amendments to the old Railway Act. Finally we have a bill. I think there is a consensus that we must get a bill passed. The point I am making is that I really regret we all have been forced into an 11th hour scenario when we really had about 13 months to deal with this bill.

In any event we have it now. As much as I regret the need to impose time allocation, for whatever reasons, I cannot accept that the opposition is responsible for the need to impose time allocation because I detect a sense on both sides of the House that we need a bill.

However we have it and I am disappointed. This is the 30th time that this government has found the need to impose time allocation in this House. I hope it does not impair our ability to produce a good bill.

There are two items here at report stage that I think require attention. One of them is the recommendation for a five-year review. This concept of a five-year review has been used in other legislation and legislation with significant impact across the broad spectrum of Canadian society.

In these modern times I do not think there is anything that could have as broad an impact on Canadian society as this telecommunications bill. We are purporting to do things, we are planning to make changes to the law and procedures that will undoubtedly have a significant impact.

I have had calls from constituents about things that are dealt with in this bill. The five-year review gives this House representing all Canadians an opportunity to bring to bear a collective perspective on how the bill has fared over the five years.

It is a very useful vehicle. It was used recently in the justice area to review the child sexual abuse provisions of the Criminal Code. I gather that report should be coming back to Parliament within a day of so. It was used earlier in this Parliament in a five-year review of the Canadian Security and Intelligence Service Act. I do not see why it should not be used for this bill.

• (1215)

Without the provision enabling a five-year review the act simply drifts on into the future without a specific opportunity for the House, for Parliament itself, to deal with the bill. Certainly officials in the department can deal with it. They can address concerns. They can make memoranda that are exchanged among bureaucrats but that will not provide an opportunity to the House to necessarily deal with these things. I do recommend that that amendment is made to the bill here at report stage.

There is another area of concern to many Canadians and I hope we can amend it here. Maybe the government will not support this but there is this vast area of what we call junk faxes or junk communications where individuals in business are making use of telephone communications or fax communications. They are even making use of the

services of the post offices in creative ways to communicate with prospective purchasers of goods or services. The problem with the fax machines, as everybody knows, is that it sits there passively and accepts whatever anyone sends to it. As long as it is turned on, and most owners of fax machines leave them on 24 hours a day, it must receive whatever commercial material is sent out. That is a bit of a problem.

We know that the CRTC has jurisdiction over this. This bill would authorize the CRTC to look at the problem but in our view it does not provide sufficient definition to the CRTC to enable it to act clearly, precisely and decisively in dealing with some of the problems that will undoubtedly crop up. We all know what happens when this House enacts imprecise legislation. What happens is that all the lobby groups and people out there who are able to afford lawyers jump in and begin litigating.

That costs the litigants lots of money. People do not think that it costs the government and the taxpayer much money but believe me it does. It uses up the resources of the justice ministry. It also from time to time causes the government to bring in outside expert counsel. With those types of initiatives we spend an awful lot of money—too much money—on outside lawyers. With all due respect to my colleague in the profession, we spend a lot of money on it.

By enacting an imprecise definition we simply create a field that is ripe for further litigation in front of the CRTC and in front of the courts when we do not really have to provide so much elbow room for our colleagues in the profession.

I would recommend to the House that we adopt a definition as proposed by the member for Mount Royal. It is a definition that is clear and more precise and narrow. It gives the CRTC a better ability to deal with this field of junk faxes.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I simply want to say that for many days we have debated legislation in this House without the minister responsible for the legislation being present. I simply want to acknowledge the fact that in spite of our opposition and perhaps our different debating points we do appreciate the fact that the Minister of Communications has made time to be in the House when his legislation is being debated.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): The question is on Motion No. 6.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

• (1220)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 7. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 8. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 10. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 11. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

We now proceed to another set of motions which I submit to the attention of the House.

Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (Okanagan—Shuswap) moved:

Motion No. 12.

That Bill C-62 be amended by deleting Clause 9.

Motion No. 13.

That Bill C-62 be amended in Clause 10 by adding immediately after line 28 at page 5 the following:

"(2) The Minister, prior to publication of the order shall advise those provinces to which the order may affect, of the forthcoming order".

Motion No. 14.

That Bill C-62 be amended in Clause 10 by striking out lines 14 to 18 at page 6.

Motion No. 16.

That Bill C-62 be amended in Clause 12 by striking out lines 47 and 48 at page 6 and substituting the following therefor:

"own motion, by order, refer the decision back to the Commission

Motion No. 17.

That Bill C-62 be amended in Clause 12

(a) by striking out lines 9 and 10 at page 7 and substituting the following therefor:

"(4) On receipt of a petition, or where of its own motion, the Governor-in-Council is considering making an order pursuant to subsection (1), the Minister shall publish in the Canada Gazette a notice either of"; and

(b) by striking out line 14 at page 7 and substituting the following therefor:

"obtained, or of the intentions of the Governor-in-Council, as the case may be."

Motion No. 18.

That Bill C-62 be amended in Clause 12 by striking out lines 29 to 37 at page 7.

Motion No. 20.

That Bill C-62 be amended in Clause 12 by striking out lines 38 and 39 at page 7 and substituting the following therefor:

"(8) In an order made under subsection 1, the Governor in Council shall set out the".

Motion No. 21.

That Bill C-62 be amended in Clause 13 by striking out line 4 at page 8 and substituting the following therefor:

"the order and shall provide a reasonable opportunity of not less than 30 days for".

[*English*]

Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal) moved:

Motion No. 22.

That Bill C-62 be amended in Clause 13 by striking out lines 4 and 5 on page 8 and substituting the following:

"the order."

• (1225)

Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (Okanagan—Shuswap) moved:

Motion No. 23.

That Bill C-62 be amended in Clause 15 by striking out line 14 at page 8 and substituting the following therefor:

"the Commission, affected carriers and other interested parties, establish standards in re-".

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to say a few words on the motions I have put forward on behalf of our caucus.

Before I start speaking to the specific amendments, I found public comments that have been made regarding the parliamentary process of the passage of this bill to be quite disconcerting, if not amusing in themselves.

As I have pointed out before, the government has been here for nine years. It has had nine years to bring in this legislation. It is important legislation. I want to say to the minister—I thank him for being present for these debates—that should the government be willing to endorse the amendments we have brought forward our caucus would have much less difficulty in approving this bill. We would support the bill if the government would support our amendments.

It is important legislation that has brought us from the horse and buggy days of the early 1900s to the high-tech wizardry of the 21st century. In that respect it is a bill that is long overdue. I speak on behalf of our caucus and I think our fellow opposition caucus, the Liberal Party, in saying that this bill is important legislation that all members have wanted to see come forward. At the same time we want to assure ourselves and the workers in the telecommunications industry as well as the consumers of telecommunications products that this is the best legislation we can put forward.

That is why we brought in this large series of amendments. We are concerned that without these changes to the legislation the bill remains seriously flawed.

I was very concerned about the process this bill took through the legislative committee. As was pointed out earlier today, we had only a few days of debate for a very extensive and technical bill. The bill contains 139 or 140 clauses. The government brought in over 50 amendments in its first draft. Then it brought in a second batch of amendments. In total the government brought in 75 amendments to a bill it had introduced only a short time earlier.

With the amendments that I and my Liberal colleagues who were also sitting on the legislative committee brought in we were dealing with well over 100 amendments. As a result of that the time constraints we were forced to work within defied the process of reasoned exchange of ideas, reasoned debate and the development of reasonable alternatives to the legislation.

Now we find that the government is saying the opposition parties are practising some sort of parliamentary subterfuge by filibustering the bill. We know that under the new rules of this House we can no longer filibuster a bill. It is simply impossible to delay the passage of a bill if the government sees fit to ram it through. The government has obviously served notice that it sees fit to ram this legislation through the House with the calling of time allocation earlier today by the minister.

We have had only an hour and a half actual debating time on report stage. Is the minister saying that we are filibustering the bill? Heavens. That is hardly adequate debate even for the few amendments that we did put forward. It is certainly not a filibuster.

We want to point out that it is absolutely essential we get sufficient time to deal with the healthy number of amendments put forward by myself and my colleague from the Liberal Party, the member for Mount Royal.

• (1230)

An hour and a half of debate was an inadequate time to discuss these amendments, yet the government decided to bring the hammer down, to call closure, or time allocation. It amounts to the same thing.

That is a shameful abuse of parliamentary privilege. I would suggest that this government is demonstrating once again the absolute arrogance it has for the democratic process and the people of Canada by abusing this parliamentary tool that it has at its disposal.

How many times have we seen closure and time allocation brought into these debates? More in this legislative sitting than all the history of previous Parliaments in Canada. It is absolutely shameful that this government is abusing that parliamentary privilege to ram through its corporate agenda, the free trade agreement, the North American free trade agreement, the GST legislation, changes to the Unemployment Insurance Act, changes to just about every facet of social programs and policies in this country.

Now we see it again bringing in closure, bringing down the hammer, closing off parliamentary debate on an extremely important piece of legislation, one of the most important pieces of legislation that the telecommunications industry has seen come forward in almost 100 years.

It is shameful that this government uses this opportunity to shut off debate and to lock out the reasoned amendments that have been put forward on behalf of the industry, the workers, and the consumers of Canada.

The minister is simply jumping to the tune that has been called by the Canadian business telecommunications alliance. These are the guys that are calling the shots on this one and the minister is simply jumping to their tune. According to *The Financial Post* of this morning obviously they have been putting a lot of pressure on the minister to ensure that this bill gets through. They want to make sure it gets through. They have given the signal to the minister to jump and he has said "how high?" They say they want it by today and you see the results of that, Mr. Speaker.

It is the telecommunications industry that has been calling the shots all the way through. The minister has simply been dancing to that tune.

We would be quite willing to support this bill if we could see these strengthening provisions agreed to by the government. We would be the first to sit down and shut up and say if it agrees to these changes then we will agree to support the bill. I am afraid after seeing how the government dealt with the recommended amendments through the legislative committee and its arrogant disposal of those submissions. I retract my statement somewhat. The government did move on a few of them and I will give it credit for that.

Some amendments are very important. The ones dealing with culture, the ones we are dealing with in this group with the provisions for over–riding decisions of the CRTC and the provisions for opting out of regulatory control are extremely important in terms of an appropriate debate.

Let us look at Motion No. 12 to see why it is important and why it should be adequately debated. The amendment to clause 9 in the bill would delete the exemption power that the government has seen to provide the CRTC. That power to exempt can also be met through the commission's power to forbear as is in the regulations through the policy directives of section 8. We do not really need this particular clause in the bill.

Without this amendment the CRTC can virtually exempt any class of carriers from regulation. This is an extension of the kind of competition and deregulation mania that has been gripping this government and which is really the driving force behind this bill.

I know my time has run out. I appreciate the opportunity to speak. I know my colleagues will be presenting specific recommendations with respect to the clauses that we would like to see brought forward in this legislation.

Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, so far today I have listened with a great deal of interest and fascination to hon. members opposite as they have poured out abuse on the government, to complain—

Mrs. Finestone: Well deserved.

Mr. Beatty: My friend rises again in mock indignation to say "well deserved" as they pour out their abuse, as they condemn the government for its arrogance and for its disregard of parliamentary democracy, as they insist that never could anything have been further from their minds than filibustering this piece of legislation. All of them get up to stress to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the Canadian people the fact that they see this as an urgent piece of legislation and one which they would want to see moved through quickly. But they are shocked that the government would finally put an end to their filibuster.

• (1235)

When hon. members opposite take this position, I think they have an obligation to be a little bit serious with the people of Canada. I listened with great interest to my friend from Mount Royal as she spoke and as she heaped abuse on me and on the government. She claims that the Liberals see the importance of this bill. She came back to this theme many times in her remarks and said it is the government's fault for any delay and not that of the opposition which continued to talk and talk and talk. She said time allocation is not justified. She claims it was wrong to say there was a filibuster on the part of the Liberals.

Let us take a look at the record because the hon. member is on record and so indeed are her colleagues. The hon. member will remember this policy paper: "Canadian Telecommunications Policy Discussion Paper for the National Liberal Caucus, Sheila Finestone, MP, Liberal Communications Critic, February 1992". What does it say in this particular document? It says:

> Liberals share the scepticism of the telecommunications industry over recent suggestions that Communications Minister Perrin Beatty remains committed to introducing the long awaited update to the century old Railway Act which governs the regulation of telecommunications in this country.

They were sceptical it was not going to be done.

In the covering communique released with the press release, the critic said this:

[*Translation*]

"Upon releasing this new document, one of a series of working papers prepared by the Official Opposition, the Liberal communications critic castigated the federal government for failing to keep the promise it made in 1984 to proceed with a bold reform of the regulatory framework for this industry. It was clear that the government's failure to act had restricted the contribution of the telecommunications industry and undermined Canada's competitive position".

[*English*]

How interesting. What happened after my Liberal critic opposite said on February 21 that no way, under no circumstances was the government going to act on this promise which was so long overdue. What happened was that six days later on February 27 Bill C-62 was introduced in the House of Commons.

If one looked at the report on business in the *Globe and Mail* the next day, one would see an interesting reaction from my friend opposite. The *Globe and Mail* said:

> However, at least one opposition critic believes the federal government may be acting prematurely—

This was the critic who had called upon the government to act six days earlier and who had said that she doubted that the government would ever move on this commitment who now said: "The government might be acting prematurely by introducing the legislation before an advisory committee on the convergence of the cable television and telecommunications industries presents its report to Mr. Beatty. The committee's report was due at the end of February but has had its deadline extended to late spring".

Listen to this quote:

> This country has waited this long for the legislation, so what's the rush now, said Matthew Behan, an assistant to Liberal communications critic Sheila Finestone.

One week before they were saying: What is the delay, why is the government stalling, will it ever make good on this promise? Six days later the government tables the bill and immediately the critic's assistant rushes to press to say they are going too quickly on this, they should be slowing down, they should be waiting longer instead of acting now.

The government then sent the bill for pre-study in the Senate to try to ensure that we would not see the sort of partisan gamesmanship that we have been seeing here in the House of Commons. The Senate subcommittee made a number of very serious and very significant recommendations, the vast majority of which were accepted by the government, but only to find that my friends from the NDP then said: Because the government responded to suggested improvements, this proves

that the bill is terribly flawed and should be delayed longer.

They cannot have it both ways. They then accused us of being undemocratic. One of the tools they used in accusing us of being so is the fact that we accepted recommendations that were made as a result of public debate and discussion and that this proved how terribly grievously flawed the bill was and how it had to be delayed even more.

• (1240)

What happened when the bill came forward for second reading in the House of Commons? Again my friends opposite will protest that they had no interest in delaying, and yet the record is very clear. *Hansard* of April 19 indicates that the Liberal Party decided to put up speaker after speaker after speaker, including one speaker simply re-reading the speech that had been given by the official critic.

The only way that second reading was achieved was by virtue of the fact that the government was able to move a motion to extend hours at the end of the day. When members of the opposition opposed the extension of hours there were not enough of them to succeed under the rules.

The bill then went to committee, where again the government was flexible, where again the government invited members of the opposition to make suggestions to improve the bill, and where again the government responded in a positive way.

The bill came back to the House and what did we find at report stage? The members of the opposition, at the same time as they were saying how desperate they were to see this bill move ahead, moved more amendments to it than they did to NAFTA. Why? Because it would give them the opportunity to speak, to delay, to filibuster. Yet they say it is unfair of me to say there was a filibuster under way.

What happened in the House of Commons? I listened to the NDP House leader a few minutes ago talking about how concerned he was about time allocation. He will recall that he asked when this was last debated at report stage that the House wrap up its proceedings for lunch early as opposed to debating these motions which were proposed by the Liberals and the NDP. I asked if there was a disposition on the part of the House to have a reasonable debate on this bill. We would be agreeable to that. What was the response from the NDP House leader? He said: "If the minister is not prepared to proceed in a more orderly fashion to permit people to participate, we have no intention of entering into any agreement to wrap this up quickly".

Now their critic says "but we really didn't mean that". I am sure that the critic for the Liberal Party will assure the House as well that she was just joking when she promised a filibuster in committee. She was just joking when she said in committee on the public record that she was going to require that the government use closure to get the bill through.

What did she say on the record in the committee? She said: "If you pull culture out I forewarn you that you will have a filibuster in this House that you will not believe and you will not get this bill through without calling closure again and demonstrating again what an undemocratic government you are".

How remarkable it is that today we heard from her that there was no intention to filibuster, notwithstanding what she said on the record in committee. Perhaps she was just joking. They were not serious. They did not mean any of this when they threatened filibuster or when they put up speaker after speaker, or when the last time this bill was being debated twice I called for an extension of hours to allow the House to sit longer to debate this bill and all of the motions, and twice the members of the opposition came in to refuse any extension of hours because they simply wanted to burn up time.

Let us be a little bit serious with the people of Canada. When my friend from Mount Royal wraps herself in righteous indignation and says how shocked she is by this, she forgets her own words where she promised a filibuster. Today she says there is no such thing.

The people of Canada deserve better than that. My friend from Okanagan—Shuswap talked earlier about the fact that I was simply doing the bidding of the Canadian business telecommunications alliance and of all of the other elements of industry and the Consumers Association of Canada, which yesterday urged Parliament to act on this bill instead of stalling any longer. But the response of members opposite has been to say that

because the bill has been promised for several years, because the bill is so long overdue, they should be—

An hon. member: Nine years.

Mr. Beatty: Exactly. They shout nine years. So they want to stall it more. Their response is that because it has taken longer than we would have liked, we want to burn up more time. Where is the logic of this? Canadians listening to this debate have a right to some element of logic on the part of members opposite. The words are clear. Their intention was filibuster. The government had no choice but to act to ensure that this piece of legislation that both the Liberals and the NDP said was so urgent could finally get through. What we were witnessing was the tyranny of the minority. It is time now for Parliament to act.

• (1245)

Mr. MacWilliam: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The minister has suggested that the only interest the opposition has is to filibuster.

I would just like to go on record as saying if the minister is agreeable to extending debate we are quite willing to sit over—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): It is not a point of order. It is a matter of debate.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Mount Royal.

Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal): Mr. Speaker, it is great when you have a selective memory like the minister does. It is quite amusing to hear the government becoming so ultra-democratic when in fact it is a word it does not even know. The government members are saying: "Let's pretend. We'll be nice people and show the world how we were thwarted in the goal we presented to them and the opportunities that were there to be really effective legislators".

The record shall speak for itself. I do not think I will dignify the minister's intervention with any further comment because it is quite a sad display.

The questions on the amendments are before us. Fortunately for the process the amendments that were made came through very careful input from the CRTC which was at the table along with the minister's staff, the staff from Stentor and the staff from Bell Canada. We heard from B.C. Tel *in camera* and then around the table.

I would not suggest for a moment that the invitation for all these interveners to be around that table came from the government. I was there and it was not a government initiative. I even invited one of the legal counsels to sit and represent the resellers, not that the resellers made any effort themselves.

We are looking right now at a series of motions brought forward by my colleagues from the NDP and one which I have put forward. The amendments to clause 9 that are being recommended relate to the exemption section. I am quite pleased that rather than removing the exemption section, as suggested by my colleague from the NDP, that section was changed from another minister's right to interfere and be subject to pressure unnecessarily from interveners or interested parties in the field of telecommunications and it is moved to the commission. It is a far more open process and it is fair to all players in this field. We will not be supporting Motion No. 12 that is up for debate which refers to clause 9.

There is nothing wrong with Motion No. 13 which touches clause 10. I have no discomfort in supporting it but it could be perceived to be redundant.

Clause 12 is very complex legislation. If the industry would care to look at the number of underlined phrases it might realize the number of changes the minister could have made. If he had put a new bill together after 1987 and had reacted to the Senate's comments earlier in 1992 we would not need such an incredible number of changes and amendments made to the bill now.

I was addressing Motion No. 16 which deals with clause 12 which is the rescind and referral clause. From my perspective there is no reason to support Motion No. 16 because I do believe it would be better to have the three options before us: the option to vary, the option to rescind and the option to refer back. Notwithstanding the fact that my preference would be to refer back as the first option, all three options have their value and place under certain circumstances.

• (1250)

There is the question of transparency, of the right of parties involved who might perceive themselves to be injured as well as those who might perceive themselves

to be the winners. That should always be open so government, not like this government, is perceived to be open and fair and always interested in the public interest first, not self-serving to their friends. This is a better bill because we have managed to improve that aspect of the bill.

I particularly want to talk to my Motion No. 22 which is somewhat related to Motion No. 21 from my colleague from the NDP. For those people who have the bill in front of them and are dealing with it as many of the legal counsels are doing, on page 8 at line 4 of the present bill, which has been redrafted, clause 13 under provincial consultation, the suggestion is that we put a period on line 4, after the word order. It would indicate that the government has the obligation to inform the provincial ministers concerned with communications. This is an interest area of all the provinces as well as the federal government, although it is entirely a federal jurisdiction.

It is important to hear from the ministers and all the provinces if they have concerns about the direction the government might be going. The power of direction is a new power in this bill. This government gave itself the power to direct the CRTC in its particular interests. I think that is a good idea because government should set the standard and the vision for the future. Then it also gave itself the power to interfere with whatever the CRTC might decide, even during hearings.

We have changed some of that and made it much more open. The government gave itself the power to consult with the provinces which is important and also allowed the potential for a veto by these various provincial ministers of communications. While we will notify the ministers in these provinces about the importance of the undertaking by the Minister of Communications, they should be able to get back to the minister and notify him about any concerns they might have. We should not have to have to wait for them to get back to talk to us.

The obligation is on the provinces to give feedback and respond to the direction the minister may decide to take. Before making a recommendation to the Governor in Council for the purpose of making a power of direction of any order, under sections 8 and 10, or before making an order under another section the minister should really be heard and have the opportunity to hear from the various provinces. It is not a technical thing but a more efficient way of ensuring it is done.

• (1255)

The last of these amendments has to do with technical standards by all parties. I think the recommended amendment is in good order and certainly will be supported by our party.

Within this section in which a whole *mélange* of different issues has been grouped together such as clauses 9, 10, 12 and 14, we are for the most part in favour of them. We are against others and shall let our voices be heard when the proper moment comes through the formal vote procedure.

Mr. Al Johnson (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to hear the hon. member's comments, particularly her rather inadequate response to the minister's comments about her filibustering. It is perhaps useful that she dealt with the more technical aspects of the bill as I would also like to do in the few minutes that are left.

The exemptions in Motion No. 12, of which Motion No. 14 is consequential, put forward by the hon. member for Okanagan—Shuswap, would have the government delete the power of exemption from the bill.

In deleting the power of exemption we would be taking away from the CRTC an important means of reducing regulatory burden. That is a goal which everyone, and certainly everyone on this side of the House with the apparent exception of the hon. member and his party, would agree.

On the issue of publication of proposed orders, the hon. member's proposed Motion No. 13 would amend clause 10 by requiring the minister when issuing an order under this bill to advise the affected provinces prior to the publication of the order. While this is certainly laudable it is redundant since it is already required under clause 13 of the bill.

On the issue of variation, rescission and referral back, the hon. member would have the government delete from clause 12 the powers of variation and rescission in his Motion No. 16. As the minister painstakingly outlined in his opening testimony before the subcommittee studying this bill, variation and rescission have been sparingly used by the government in the past and always in a responsible manner. These powers are based on the premise that decisions of fundamental public policy should be made not by regulators but by the government.

For the foregoing reasons Motion No. 16 should be rejected as should related Motions Nos. 17, 18 and 20 which also relate to clause 12.

Motion No. 17 is especially dangerous. By requiring the minister to publish a notice in the *Canada Gazette* when the Governor in Council is considering making an order, it would have the effect of publishing advance notice of proposed cabinet decisions. Since this would unduly interfere in the cabinet process this motion is completely unacceptable.

Motion No. 18, and Motion No. 20 which is consequential, should be rejected since they would remove the Governor in Council's power to vary, rescind or refer back again a CRTC decision that is the result of a previous refer back. This may be necessary in cases where the CRTC has not complied with government policy subsequent to a refer back.

On the important matter of provincial consultations, on Motion No. 21 the hon. member seeks to unduly constrain the Governor in Council by specifying a time frame in which the minister must consult with his provincial counterparts on proposed orders. I would remind him that clause 13 as written does not prevent the specifying of a time limit for consultations. Indeed the concept of a specified time period is implicit in this clause as it has been drafted. An appropriate time period may be very short or very long depending on the subject matter of any particular order. Since it would not be appropriate to specify any particular time limit this motion should also be rejected.

Finally with respect to technical standards, just as in the case of Motion No. 13 referred to earlier, this motion is redundant in that there already is provision for full public consultation before technical standards are established. Reference to the required public consultations may be found in clause 15(3).

In conclusion I would say that all motions in the fourth group should be rejected.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock this afternoon, pursuant to Standing Order 24(2).

The House took recess at 1 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 31

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Guy Saint-Julien (Abitibi): Madam Speaker, Quebec's agricultural sector strenuously objects to the plans of the federal Minister of Agriculture as expressed in the draft bill on the western grain transportation subsidy, also known as the Crow rate. Quebec is in favour of changes that would reduce transportation costs and restore parity between eastern and western ports.

According to Quebec agriculture minister Yvon Picotte, it was unacceptable after years of study by committees to create a new committee without the appropriate mandate and outlook that would guarantee federal funds would be applied either to the transportation of grain outside the prairies or to a program fair to all Canadian producers. That is why Quebec's four party leaders have revived the Quebec coalition on the Crow rate. Picotte went on to say that their sole objective was to make Ottawa recognize the interests of Quebec agriculture.

Quebec's position is clear, and I want to say that I personally support that position today.

* * *

[*English*]

VIOLENCE IN THE MEDIA

Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River): Madam Speaker, at a recent meeting of the Scarborough Board of Education educators expressed concern over increasingly violent student behaviour.

They noted that there is increasing evidence that exposure to television violence has a negative influence on children and the often excessively violent behaviour

demonstrated by some students appears to be modelled on the types of violent behaviour presented in the media.

The Scarborough Board of Education and Scarborough elementary and secondary principals and vice-principals are calling upon the CRTC, producers and media distributors to voluntarily take steps to reduce the amount of television violence and to take further action to reduce the access of young viewers to such violence in the media.

We must take hold of violence in the media before it takes hold of our society.

* * *

[*Translation*]

TRIBUTE TO HUGUES MORISSETTE

Mr. Marcel R. Tremblay (Québec-Est): Madam Speaker, today I would like to pay tribute to Hugues Morissette, Director General of the Secrétariat à la mise en valeur du Saint-Laurent. Mr. Morissette, one of the founders of the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes maritime forum, was recently declared 1993 celebrity of the year by the Great Lakes Commission on behalf of the States of Illinois, Michigan, New York, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Minnesota, Ohio and Wisconsin.

He received this award in recognition of his exceptional contribution to the greater maritime St. Lawrence-Great Lakes region. Furthermore, Mr. Morissette was directly associated with the St. Lawrence Maritime Chamber and the International Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Mayors Conference.

I join with them in congratulating him for his extraordinary commitment to the improvement of our environment.

* * *

[*English*]

NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands): Madam Speaker, as the Ontario New Democrats stumble and plod along to the detriment of all Ontarians their rudderless cousins on the federal scene desperately struggle to distance themselves from Bob Rae's massive display of ineptitude and mismanagement.

Premier Rae said something recently with which all members of the House can agree. Commenting after a fund raising event at which the hon. member for Yukon was heckled by her own supporters the premier said that he does not think his split with union leaders will hurt her chances of becoming prime minister.

Since the NDP has absolutely no chance of forming the next federal government he is of course correct. One cannot weaken an impossibility.

In these uncertain times it is soothing to find at least one New Democrat who can recognize reality, who knows that his party does not have a hope of forming the next government and is willing to say so. When polling day arrives Canadians will ensure that all New Democrats have their eyes opened to reality.

* * *

OCEANS DAY

Hon. David MacDonald (Rosedale): Madam Speaker, a year ago today, on June 8, at the United Nations Conference on the Environment and Development we acknowledged Oceans Day for the first time.

Since then there has been widespread support in both the national and international communities for the establishment of an annual global oceans day to raise public awareness and promote co-operative action for the health of the world's oceans.

The Oceans Institute of Canada in co-operation with citizens' groups, government and industry is co-ordinating Oceans Day '93 with public events and an international conference in Halifax. Activities are also planned for this day in other Atlantic provinces and British Columbia.

As all members know, the oceans play a vital role in sustaining life and livelihoods in this and all other countries. Over half the world's population lives within 60 kilometres of the oceans, which cover 70 per cent of this planet's surface.

• (1405)

Indeed, as we know now from our astronauts, when we look back at the earth it is not a green planet but a blue one. We should celebrate this blue planet on Oceans Day, June 8.

HARASSMENT

Mr. Dan Heap (Trinity—Spadina): Madam Speaker, for the past 13 years Anne Uzoabo has been racially harassed at work as a nurse at the Kingston Prison for Women. The harassment escalated to the point where she received anonymous death threats in the mail directed against her children and herself, calling them niggers and telling them that if she did not quit her job they would die.

The letters all bear a swastika. Kleenex containing human faeces was found stuck to her car. The harassment seems to be originating from within the prison staff.

A privately conducted investigation claimed there was no basis for Ms. Uzoabo's concerns and blamed her for enduring racial slurs.

I call upon the minister to conduct an independent public inquiry into this matter immediately.

* * *

[*Translation*]

WAR CRIMES

Mrs. Suzanne Duplessis (Louis-Hébert): Madam Speaker, today a coalition of Croatian and Bosnian women from Montreal, the National Action Committee on the Status of Women, the Fédération des femmes du Québec and the Civil Liberties Union tabled a petition with 13,000 signatures, asking the Canadian government to continue its efforts to help rape victims in Bosnia-Hercegovina and Croatia.

The coalition asks Canada to ensure that the international tribunal established by the UN to judge war crimes committed in the former Yugoslavia has an equal number of men and women and includes Canadian woman judges.

I fully support this admirable initiative and I want to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs to do everything in her power to act on this request. We are talking about the lives of women and children who have suffered atrociously and we must do everything we can to stop further suffering.

[*English*]

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

Mrs. Christine Stewart (Northumberland): Madam Speaker, to corroborate the words of my colleague across the House, today in Montreal women's groups from across the country are joining together to stage a rally in protest of the systemic rape of women and children in Bosnia-Hercegovina and Croatia.

Reports from the European Community Commission and the United Nations Human Rights Commission confirm the rape of some 20,000 to 60,000 women and children in the former Yugoslavia. We are appalled to learn that such abuses occur on all sides of the conflict.

I urge the Government of Canada to press the United Nations to commit to the following recommendations: 1) the permanent entrenchment of sexual assault as a war crime under the Geneva convention; 2) the securing of appropriate medical, psychological and other forms of attention and care for the women and children raped and assaulted, and the provision of financial support to that end; 3) the expansion of the UN definition of a refugee to include women and children who are directly or indirectly victims of gender-based violence and that the UN member states offer them refuge; and 4) that the UN approved war crimes tribunal have equal representation from women.

* * *

[*Translation*]

L'ORDRE DU MÉRITE NORD-CÔTIER

Mr. Charles A. Langlois (Manicouagan): Madam Speaker, the North Shore has paid a well-deserved tribute to 11 men and women who, for many years, have worked with great dedication to help their community and promote their region.

Dedicating one's time and talents to helping others and promoting our communities is indeed a noble calling.

This tradition of community service is practiced daily by Father Charles Doyon, Imelda Dechamplain, Jeanne-Aimé Lévesque, Jean-Marie Martin, Jean L'Heureux,

Gilbert St-Gelais and Lyne Poirier, as it was by Father Alexis Jouveneau, Simon and Christian Proulx and Alain Potvin, who are no longer with us.

Last Sunday, they were given the highest awards of the *Ordre du Mérite Nord-Côtier*.

I too wish to express my thanks and appreciation for what they have done.

* * *

[*English*]

CHIEF BIG BEAR

Mr. Len Taylor (The Battlefords—Meadow Lake): Madam Speaker, I rise today to support Chief Blaine Favel, the council and the people of Poundmaker Cree Nation who are taking steps to properly honour one of the First Nations great chiefs, Big Bear.

On July 16 the people of Poundmaker will unveil a cairn dedicated to the memory of Chief Big Bear who devoted his life to peace and the well-being of his people.

Big Bear's intentions in negotiating treaty for his people and his leadership during and after the rebellion of 1885 were continually misunderstood by the government and the courts. He was a principled and dedicated man whose historical record must be corrected.

It is time, during the International Year for World Indigenous Peoples, that Big Bear's proper place in history be restored.

• (1410)

The cairn on the Poundmaker reserve where Big Bear's body is buried is the start of a fitting national tribute to this great leader.

I urge the federal government to support this worthwhile effort.

* * *

[*Translation*]

TIOXIDE CANADA

Mr. Louis Plamondon (Richelieu): Madam Speaker, Tioxide Canada of Tracy was sentenced on May 31 to a fine of $4 million after it pleaded guilty to pollution charges.

In his ruling Mr. Justice Bélanger ordered the company to pay $3 million of the $4 million within 30 days for wildlife habitat restoration projects. Since the Sorel-Tracy region was the first to suffer this pollution every day for 30 years I ask the Minister of the Environment to require that the Canadian Wildlife Service invest this money in the Lake Saint-Pierre archipelago and especially in the St. Anne islands and Lavallière Bay.

* * *

[*English*]

DANGEROUS OFFENDERS

Mr. Scott Thorkelson (Edmonton—Strathcona): Madam Speaker, Canadians know that over all our corrections system works well. Most prisoners serve their time and successfully return to society. However Canadians are concerned about those few truly dangerous offenders who cannot or will not be rehabilitated.

Several weeks ago I encouraged the Solicitor General to consider possible means to keep these few dangerous offenders behind bars at all times, even after their sentence has expired. It does not make sense to release an individual from prison when everyone who knows that person expects him or her to commit another offence and hurt or kill another person.

Today I would like to congratulate the Solicitor General on his draft legislation which has safeguards and which proposes a means to protect Canadians from these dangerous few. Under this legislation, as a high risk offender nears the end of his or her sentence the Crown attorney may ask the courts to designate the person as a dangerous offender resulting in a continued and indefinite sentence.

This legislation is in draft form because the minister needs input from Canadians. I firmly support his initiative and encourage other Canadians to support it as well.

* * *

YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT

Ms. Mary Clancy (Halifax): Madam Speaker, the Liberal Party recognizes that the Young Offenders Act is in need of change. It consequently has proposed changes which would strike a good balance between deterrence, justice and fairness.

First, sentence lengths for murder must be increased to ensure full treatment and rehabilitation and access to treatment and rehabilitation not available under the present act.

It would end the practice of automatically clearing the records at age 21 of offendus convicted of serious crimes. It would develop a category of dangerous youth offender for repeat youth offenders who commit serious crimes, enabling them to be tried and convicted in adult court.

Both parents and children alike are scared of the increasing violence in school yards. A 12-year old girl should not have to take medication for stress caused by being threatened with a knife. A Liberal government would work to ensure the safety of our youth and of all Canadians.

* * *

FUR INDUSTRY

Mr. John A. MacDougall (Timiskaming—French River): Madam Speaker, earlier today the chairman of the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs tabled a report entitled *Canada Fur Watch: Aboriginal Livelihood at Risk*.

May I thank the members of the committee for their excellent work on this report. Twenty-three recommendations have been sent to the government. Groups such as the Fur Institute of Canada, Ontario Trappers Association, North American Fur Action, Indigenous Survival International, Fur Council of Canada, the Wild Fur Council and the Aboriginal Trappers Federation of Canada all came forward in a united stand for the industry.

One hundred thousand Canadians are involved in this industry. Meeting the standards set out for 1995 is very important for the future of our industry.

I thank the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and the Minister of the Environment for their support. As I will be leaving the House of Commons later this year I hope that future governments will continue to support this industry, as we have for many years.

* * *

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

Ms. Dawn Black (New Westminster—Burnaby): Madam Speaker, since December my New Democrat colleagues and I have written letters, made statements in the House and public speeches to pressure the Canadian government to take the international leadership needed to close the rape-death camps of Bosnia and help the victims.

We were successful earlier this year in having the definition of a refugee expanded to include violence against women. The government has taken some positive steps, but the horror of the mass rape and killings continues.

Today in Montreal human rights and women's groups are releasing a petition signed by over 13,000 people calling for freedom and help for the women and children from these rape camps. The petition also asks for equal representation of women on the UN war crimes tribunal and protection of civilian populations.

I support this petition and insist that the government not relegate Bosnia to the back burner. Action is needed and it is needed now.

* * *

• (1415)

PENSIONS

Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal): Madam Speaker, the seniors who built this country and now give generously of their time to others will receive their quarterly OAS cheque with a $1.91 minimum increase. It is better than the 37 cents or the 75 cents received in the past, but this increase will scarcely purchase tea and toast.

The last time seniors got consideration and a real increase for those in need was in a 1984 Liberal budget giving a $50 increase per month for those on GIS.

In my riding of Mount Royal 25 per cent of the citizens are seniors. Cutbacks in transfer payments and the impact on health care services are of real concern. The increases they receive on their OAS are subject to income tax and are held to a 3 per cent inflationary factor. They do not reflect the increases they face in daily living, medication, transportation, utility bills and rent, all of which surpassed the rate of inflation.

Presently people receive $10,056 per year as seniors if they are receiving the full GIS. Let us also—

Madam Deputy Speaker: The member's time has long expired.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

THE ECONOMY

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Finance, but before doing so I would like to say that we are sorry to see him leaving. He has been a colleague of all of us for 25 years. He has done a very good job for his constituents. I had the privilege of being in his riding a few times because my mother's family is from that riding. He is a man of judgment and I understand him very well. He does not want to come back to this side of the House.

I have a question for him about the financial problems of the nation. Some nine years ago his Prime Minister promised to "inflict prosperity on Atlantic Canada". Today the Conservative poverty critic said that conditions in Atlantic Canada were so bad that "Canadians will want to be sending food to the maritimes. It is Third World conditions there".

Does the Minister of Finance agree with the member for Don Valley North on this point, that the maritimes endure Third World conditions after nine years of Conservative government?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance): Madam Speaker, I want to thank the Leader of the Opposition for his warm and generous comments. He has visited my riding on one or two occasions. As he found out at those times, and it is still the case, all his relatives still vote for me.

As a matter of fact when he campaigned in 1968 against me I think his campaign visit to my riding lasted about a half an hour. He walked into a coffee party and they made it very clear that Liberals and others were going to vote for Maz.

Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre): That was 20 years ago.

Mr. Mazankowski: It is the same today, Lloyd.

Concerning the point the hon. Leader of the Opposition has raised, he knows very well there are some difficult problems affecting the Atlantic region, particularly those relating to the depletion of the fish stocks. This government has responded in a massive way in support of the fishermen and the processors, as well as the communities affected by the depletion of stocks. In addition the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency which brought about a new form of regional development assistance to broaden the economic base of the Atlantic region has worked very well. In addition also we have had a massive infrastructure program to improve the highway system, the Atlantic Expressway, as well as support for the Hibernia project.

There has been an untold number of initiatives and an untold amount of federal government support for the Atlantic region. Quite clearly the effect will be renewed prosperity and job creation that will serve not only this generation but future generations.

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Speaker, I have to say that in those days my relatives did not know he was going to be the Minister of Finance.

• (1420)

Now that he is Minister of Finance they have the good common sense to realize they made a mistake if they voted for him in those days. One of my cousins is a candidate for the Liberal Party in the riding of Elk Island and he will win.

Is it not time to stop the nonsense to create an impression? The people in eastern Canada and elsewhere in Canada who do not have work are not waiting for government handouts. What is needed in Canada at this time is not a new definition of poverty but jobs for these people so they can come home every night with pride and put bread and butter on the table for their families.

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance): Madam Speaker, at one point in time in my 25-year career I can say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition there was a sense that some of his relatives had become supportive. However he became the President of the Treasury Board and the Minister of Finance and did a lousy job. Then he became the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, and he lost them for good.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition says they do not want handouts; they want jobs. I just came back from the OECD meeting. Sometimes good news does not travel very fast but in this case it really did. Here is one headline: "Canada poised to top G-7 growth". "Canadian recovery has taken a firm hold, says economic

agencies". "Canada's economy will beat other G-7 countries, says the OECD". "Canada's economy leader in growth". "Growth spurt for Canada". "Canada's the most popular country for U.S. investment".

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Speaker, the question is very simple. We want to know if a new definition of poverty will solve the problem of poverty in Canada. All these headlines do nothing for the 1.6 million people in Canada who have no jobs today.

[*Translation*]

When will the Minister of Finance stop imitating the Prime Minister by congratulating himself, and start looking after Canada's real problems by giving work to Canadians who are more than willing to work so that they can go back home with pride every night of the week?

[*English*]

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance): Madam Speaker, I was not congratulating myself. I was reading some newspaper headlines which came not from me but from the OECD. What is wrong with that? The hon. member has a tendency to quote bad news. Once in a while I have the opportunity to quote some good news.

He asks about Atlantic Canada. Just to give him and the country some specific examples, the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency was created and has committed $800 million to some 9,100 projects through its action program. ACOA has also committed $1.1 billion to 77 co-operation initiatives. The government launched the Hibernia program, a $5.2 billion frontier oil production facility.

The Minister of Public Works and other ministers are working very carefully and very closely with the province of New Brunswick and the province of Prince Edward Island to ensure that the fixed link goes ahead. It will be a major public works program.

There are many initiatives in addition to the solid foundation for growth we have put in place through our policies.

POVERTY

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Madam Speaker, my question is for the same minister.

According to the latest Tory report the homeless are not really homeless; they are just people who have chosen open air accommodation. The million children lined up at food banks, according to the government, are simply using community-based fast food outlets. The jobless are not really jobless; they are just less than partially employed. This Tory report is patronizing, pandering and dangerous.

I want to ask the Minister of Finance a direct question. Will he repudiate the report by one of his colleagues which puts the poor people of Canada on the defensive instead of having a government on the offensive on the issue?

Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Madam Speaker, before making any assessment about the report, we would like to have the time to read it. We will do that and comment afterward.

• (1425)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Madam Speaker, now we see the Conservatives for what they really are. Only days before the Conservative leadership convention and after nine years in office they are brazenly announcing that poverty is a figment of our imagination. According to them the United Nations is wrong, Statistics Canada is wrong and the experts are wrong.

Now that a big party is being organized for the Prime Minister, is the minister proud of the fact that his government has failed to help millions of Canadians who are living in poverty? Why does he want to make victims of the poor instead of having a proactive government policy? I expect a reply from the Prime Minister, since he is stepping down.

Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Madam Speaker, the hon. member for Hamilton East persists in not getting her facts straight. Every day during the past nine years that I have been in the House she has shown a total lack of concern for the

facts. Thank goodness Canadians are starting to realize this.

My answer is simply that if we consider how the government helped children last year, and I am talking about last year, not the entire nine-year period, we invested more than $2.6 billion in direct assistance to families and helping children in need. The hon. member may be partisan but she should at least recognize the government's record, which has no connection with the nasty remarks she made in her preamble about the Conservative Party's leadership campaign.

[*English*]

Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

Two weeks ago the United Nations produced a report condemning Canada for its high levels of poverty. Yet today the subcommittee on poverty released a report denying that the problem even exists.

I might add that members of this party refused to sit on the subcommittee because we knew that all it was going to do was try to provide statistics instead of address the issue of poverty. A report that tells the majority of Canadians who are poor that they are not really poor does nothing to address poverty.

The Minister of National Health and Welfare had the courage to speak up on behalf of all of us who feel very strongly about medicare that user fees would be wrong for medicare. Will the minister stand up against this report and say that the way to address poverty is not to attack the poor but in fact to put in place a plan for full employment? That will really address the poor in the country.

Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Madam Speaker, I would hope the Leader of the New Democratic Party will have the decency to allow me the time to read the report tabled this morning. I will read the report and make comments afterward.

Second, the member says we have done nothing about poverty. Day after day in the House of Commons I have said that it remains, it was and is still, one of the most outstanding problems all countries in the world, particularly ours, are facing now. For all those reasons I fully support what has been done by the Minister of Finance in trying to find jobs. Day after day the member has said she would like to find jobs.

I am pleased the Minister of Finance has worked in such a way that we are moving toward a better economy which will give jobs to Canadians and decrease poverty. That is the way we work. I prefer that to what all NDP governments have done so far which has not been very successful.

Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon): Madam Speaker, it is interesting that this outgoing government which leaves the most unemployed ever in the history of Canada can comment on other governments.

I would like to say that today I put forward a private member's bill on a full employment strategy. I hope the minister will support it.

[*Translation*]

The poor do not want hand-outs. They just want jobs. Quebec's 750,000 welfare recipients want jobs. The poor want policies that will help them find jobs, they want day care for their children, and they want training. Why will the government not introduce a full employment policy? When will this government stop attacking the poor and start attacking poverty?

• (1430)

Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of National Health and Welfare): First of all, Madam Speaker, the Leader of the New Democratic Party is totally wrong when she says that today we are faced with the highest jobless rate ever in Canada. That is absolutely false. Furthermore, the hon. member tabled a bill on full employment. I am astonished she did not first send her proposals to the Government of Ontario which has to cut 10,000 government jobs. It would have appreciated those proposals, more so than the unions which support her party.

[*English*]

Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon): Madam Speaker, I have a supplementary question. The question of poverty in this country is surely of serious concern to everyone in this House.

I want to say to the Minister of National Health and Welfare that all of us in this House voted in November 1989 to work to eliminate child poverty by the year 2000. Yet we saw today in the government's own poverty subcommittee report that the solution to poverty was to

change, to reduce the poverty line. We should be addressing the fact that we are raising a generation of children of which one in six are living in poverty.

I want to ask the minister of health and welfare this: We are faced with a really serious problem. One of the solutions that the chair of the subcommittee on poverty mentioned is we could ship food to the maritimes. I want to ask the minister of health and welfare if he agrees that that is the solution to poverty or does he think there should be a real plan in place for the poor of Canada, not simply a change in the statistic line?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, I thank my hon. friend for a very important question.

Obviously the problem of income inequality and poverty distribution in Canada has been exacerbated here as it has elsewhere in the industrialized countries by some 2.5 to three years by a very difficult economic situation.

Mr. Rodriguez: Tory government.

Mr. Mulroney: My hon. friend from northern Ontario says Tory government. There is no Tory government in France. It had a socialist government and just underwent the most severe economic recession since the war. My hon. friend should be ready to recognize that. Whether it is a democratic government in the United States or a Conservative government in Canada, a socialist government in Ontario or Australia, this is world-wide. In light of this, how have we deployed quite limited resources in difficult times?

An hon. member: Cutbacks.

Mr. Mulroney: My hon. friend says cutbacks. Perhaps she would like to listen to this.

In 1984 when we came in, the total amount of federal social expenditures—I can point them out from OAS, to child benefits, to job creation, to veterans, social housing and so on—was $56.1 billion a year. This year they are $103.3 billion a year.

In spite of our difficult economic times, we have increased federal social expenditures at a rate of 7 per cent a year every year, although government expenditures have been contained to 3 per cent. As a proportion of GDP—and I think this will interest my hon. friend—12.6 per cent of the total GDP expenditures in 1984 were devoted to social expenditures. Today they are 14.4 per cent, a significant improvement.

I want to point out to my hon. friend that while it is not perfect, Canada has made more progress in this area than any other industrialized country in the world.

Ms. Albina Guarnieri (Mississauga East): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

Today's poverty committee report asks the minister to set a new renamed poverty line below which are only families who would have "serious difficulty in living healthy and physically acceptable lives". The report says a family of four living in Toronto, earning more than $25,000, has money to spare and should not be thought poor.

I want to ask the minister to explain how a worker can support a spouse and two children on $500 a week.

Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Madam Speaker, the member refers to a report which I said twice I would like to read before making any comment on it. My answer to her will be the same answer I gave to her predecessor. I will read the report first and comment afterward.

• (1435)

Ms. Albina Guarnieri (Mississauga East): Madam Speaker, perhaps the minister should consult his conscience rather than his government's committee.

My supplementary question is for the same minister. Liberal recommendations to deliver direct relief through school food programs to children living in poverty were dismissed by Conservative members of the poverty committee as being irrelevant to their statistical measurements. How can playing with statistics and fudging the numbers do any good for children living in poverty?

Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Madam Speaker, I have already answered that question.

Mr. Rey Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North): Madam Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

Children who are poor cannot eat line graphs. Yet that is what today's Tory subcommittee report on child poverty gives them.

The report condemns the nationally accepted low income cut-off, LICO, as a valid measure of poverty. Yet only last December the minister accepted LICO as the measure for Canada's efforts against poverty at the Organization of Economic Co-operation and Development meeting in Europe.

Will the minister now reject the report that creates only pretty lines for the government and instead act to create real answers to the needs of the poor?

Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Madam Speaker, once again I repeat what I have said.

We have had four reports recently, from the UN, from the National Council of Welfare, Caledon, and the subcommittee on poverty. I just ask the opportunity to be able to read the reports before commenting.

I have given the same answer 10 times.

Mr. Rey Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North): Madam Speaker, I would like to remind the Minister of National Health and Welfare that on the report on the HIV tainted blood tragedy he was able to adopt when questioned by this member, by this opposition, one recommendation of the committee on the same day the report was tabled. Why can he not answer today?

The National Council of Welfare regards LICOs as poverty lines. Its report released four days ago concludes "the only guarantee that welfare offers consistently is poverty".

Will the minister ignore the definition used by his own citizens' advisory body and further lower social assistance or will he ignore—

Madam Deputy Speaker: Would the hon. member put his question? This is getting into a speech.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Madam Speaker, I missed the last part of the question, but I assume it was a corollary of the previous one. I said that I would give the same answer, if necessary I will read the report, and then I will be in a position to comment.

[*English*]

Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

The Prime Minister will remember that yesterday the Minister of National Health and Welfare said that poverty was on the increase in Canada.

He will remember too that in 1989 he voted with all other members of the House of Commons to eliminate child poverty by the year 2000. Today he knows three of his own members have issued a report which would reduce poverty by redefining it.

Is this what the Prime Minister had in mind when he voted in 1989 to eliminate child poverty by the year 2000, by changing the figures rather than finding solutions to resolve it?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, why would my hon. friend ask a question of such importance in such a vexatious manner?

Everyone in this House has treated the question of child poverty with the greatest seriousness. I have just provided his leader with facts and figures indicating that the Government of Canada and the people of Canada have dramatically increased their assistance to social programs, including those for children.

One child living in poverty is one child too many. The object of the exercise of programs initiated by the minister of health, $2.6 billion for example in new money alone, indicates the enormous commitment and sensitivity of all Canadians to this problem of children living in poverty. That is the record. That is the record—

• (1440)

Ms. Black: Why are there more poor children?

Mr. Mulroney: Madam Speaker, my hon. friends in the NDP are asking questions. They apparently prefer not to have the answer.

All I can do is indicate—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing): Madam Speaker, more children are living in poverty today than there were when this government came to power. Those are the facts no matter what the government has done.

I would like to ask the Prime Minister about his commitment under the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. He knows that he agreed to provide Canada's children with first call on the nation's resources in good and bad times.

Child poverty is on the increase. This government has spent $5.8 billion on helicopters while child poverty continues to rise. Is this what he means by fulfilling the commitment to Canada's children?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, this is exactly the way in which a serious problem is trivialized by members of the NDP.

I just indicated to his leader that this year we are spending $103.3 billion on social expenditures, a major portion of which is devoted quite properly to children.

My hon. friend points to an expenditure he disagrees with spread over 14 years which averages approximately $200 million a year—which he deplores for our national defence. Whereas $2.6 billion, 14 times that amount, was deployed in a new initiative last year by the Minister of National Health and Welfare to assist children.

Why does he not stop trivializing Canada and its achievements and work with people constructively to help children rather than engage in this kind of attack?

* * *

HOUSING

Mr. Joe Fontana (London East): Madam Speaker, last month the Minister of State for Finance told the House that housing starts were expected to increase throughout the year, but to the surprise of no one there has been a large drop in new housing construction so far this year from the abysmal level in 1992.

This is not just a short-term phenomenon. Figures released this morning indicate that housing starts fell 14 per cent in May. Contrary to everything this government has to say about the economy, new housing construction is still stuck in recession.

When will the Minister of Finance admit that Canadians have no confidence in an economic recovery and have no confidence in this government's policies?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance): Madam Speaker, it is somewhat discouraging but the hon. member knows that month to month statistics tend to be very volatile.

If he were to look at the housing starts in the first two months of this quarter there were about 14,000 more units than in the first quarter of 1993. I think he has to look at a longer period of time in order to get a more accurate reflection of the reality of the situation.

I remind the hon. member that housing affordability is at an all-time high. Interest rates are the lowest in 20 years. There are lots of opportunities at the present time for people to become engaged in housing through the low down payment that was provided through the co-operation of the minister responsible for CMHC as well as by tapping into their RRSPs.

The conditions are right for a vibrant housing industry. I have every expectation that we will see a continued increase in housing starts as we proceed throughout the year.

Mr. Joe Fontana (London East): Madam Speaker, all that would be correct if a person had a job or could look forward to a job. That is the problem with this government's policies.

The minister should know because he said on a month to month basis the figures are volatile. The fact remains that for the first quarter of this year housing starts are down 13 per cent.

The point is this: His own officials keep quoting 182,000 units a year when in fact the entire industry, including the Canadian Bankers Association, Clayton Research and even the CMHC, says that the starts will be less than 20,000.

Thousands of construction workers are out of work. Hundreds of construction companies are waiting to work. When will the government put people back to work, give people a chance to work, and start up housing construction in this country?

• (1445)

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance): Madam Speaker, I just indicated that the fundamentals are in place, low inflation and low interest rates. A number of incentives for the construc-

tion industry, in particular the home building industry, are in place. I ask the hon. member to once again look at it not in terms of the month to month volatility but indeed a longer period of time.

The hon. member states that the decline is continuing. I say that with the growth that has occurred in the economy in the first quarter of almost 4 per cent, backed up by the strong performance in the fourth quarter of 1992 of 3.5 per cent, the hon. member should be encouraged. Any other data that we see is very encouraging. That is exactly why the IMF and the OECD have proclaimed Canada to have the best growth rate in 1993 and in 1994 and indeed the best job creation rate.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PROGRAM FOR OLDER WORKER ADJUSTMENT

Mr. Alfonso Gagliano (Saint-Léonard): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Labour. The criteria for the Program for Older Worker Adjustment unfairly penalize older employees in small businesses in the Montreal area.

Does the minister think it is fair that a worker aged 55 or over and laid off by a company where there are 100 lay-offs, is eligible for POWA, but a worker laid off by a company with only 50 lay-offs is not?

Hon. Marcel Danis (Minister of Labour): Madam Speaker, the hon. member is aware that the government made some changes to the former program put in place by the Liberals, adding POWA to help people aged 55 and over. I must admit that I would like to change the criteria if we had enough money to do that. For instance, last year, the federal governmnent invested $70 million in POWA, and altogether we are paying more than $233 million in annuities for these workers. I think the federal government has done something worthwhile. Of course, if we had more money we would be able to do more, but considering the state of the economy I think we are doing a good job.

Mr. Alfonso Gagliano (Saint-Léonard): Madam Speaker, I have a supplementary for the same minister. He must be aware that in the Montreal area alone, 83 per cent of older workers laid off as a result of plant closures receive no assistance at all. When is he going to act to correct a situation that was created by his own government?

Hon. Marcel Danis (Minister of Labour): Madam Speaker, I think the hon. member's statistics, and I am referring to the 83 per cent who receive no assistance at all, must be totally inaccurate. My colleague, the Minister of Employment and Immigration, helps workers who lose their jobs by providing training programs.

As for POWA, I can inform the hon. member that last year in consultation with the Government of Quebec we changed the criteria. As the hon. member well knows, until last year workers had to be employed for 15 or 20 consecutive years to be eligible. To include more people under the program, especially women, we made it 13 years instead of 15, at the request of the Quebec Government.

* * *

[*English*]

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops): Madam Speaker, my question is for the right hon. Prime Minister.

I think the Prime Minister would agree that this morning a lot of Canadians were encouraged when they read the press reports that in light of all the discussion about inclusive politics and after listening to Canadians the Minister of the Environment indicated that he was seriously considering, based on the advice of his colleague from Calgary North, scrapping the GST.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Riis: I wonder if the Prime Minister would do the right thing: While celebrating with his colleagues at his going away party on Friday night, which of course a lot of people will be cheering, if he wants to hear a cheer go up from coast to coast to coast, stand up and say that he is going to follow the minister's advice and scrap the GST.

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, I think my hon. friend should really read very carefully what the Minister of the Environment said. I think there indeed will be cheers across the country on Sunday night. There will be a lot of tears at the thought that I will not be around.

• (1450)

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Mulroney: But you know, Madam Speaker, they are just going to have to get over it.

My hon. friend is quite right. There will be cheers for the election of a new Conservative leader who will become the 19th Prime Minister of Canada and lead this government, because of courageous policies like the GST, to a third consecutive majority government.

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops): Madam Speaker, I suspect there will be tears on Friday night but they will be tears of joy. Canadians will finally say: "After 10 years now our Prime Minister is leaving". Hopefully his follower will follow the suggestion he has indicated in the press today, that he is reconsidering the wisdom of preserving the GST.

My question for the Prime Minister is this: In the recent issue of the *Canadian Tax Journal* it indicates that because of the goods and services tax and in spite of what was promised, it has resulted in a tremendous shift into the underground economy that will cost in terms of revenue losses for this year $2.3 billion, in one year alone.

Add to that the fact that the Canadian Federation of Independent Business estimates that it costs small business in excess of $9 billion to collect this tax. Will the Prime Minister now admit that the GST is stifling the economy in terms of the job generating small business sector and is encouraging our economy to go more underground than ever?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, I would think it would be the contrary.

My hon. friend's party for almost four years endorsed recommendations of various kinds, many times unanimously, of parliamentary committees saying to the federal government: "You must have the courage to abolish the manufacturers' sales tax and substitute therefor a consumption tax".

Moreover my hon. friend's party signed that report and said: "If you want to be fair and honest you must make that consumption tax visible so that the Canadian people will know what they are paying as opposed to having a hidden secret 13.5 per cent manufacturing sales tax that penalizes our manufacturing base".

We brought in, pursuant to a unanimous recommendation that my hon. friend's party signed as did the Liberals, a consumption tax. We made it visible. It now is working its way through the Canadian economy. Because it is momentarily unpopular, my hon. friend is running for the hills.

The next election campaign is going to be about those who had the courage to take unpopular actions and not run with their tails between their legs just because a Gallup poll turned bad on them.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Lac-Saint-Jean): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture.

The minister announced recently that he intends to give directly to western farmers the $650 million subsidy paid to railways for grain transportation. The minister knows this would give western farmers an undue advantage compared to Quebec farmers. In fact, this $650 million in federal funds could be used to diversify western agriculture, so that it could compete unacceptably with Quebec farmers.

I ask the minister to tell the House if he really intends to continue on such a provocative course towards Quebec.

Hon. Pierre Blais (Minister of Justice, Attorney General of Canada and Minister of State (Agriculture)): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member had been in the House yesterday he would know because I explained the situation to those present. Farmers from all regions of Canada agree that the archaic Crow rate should be changed, and Quebecers agree with the principles of what we put forward and of the consultation paper tabled this week by my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture.

Yes, the Government of Quebec and other people we met with three or four times expressed some reservations about how the payment would be made to farmers so that these changes would not adversely affect the Maritimes, Ontario or Quebec. That is exactly why we tabled this consultation paper, so that it could be discussed widely and freely with all Canadians.

I hope that the hon. member will be able to read the consultation paper, to talk about it, to express his own views and to show that what is being done is for the benefit of Canadian farmers.

• (1455)

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Lac-Saint-Jean): Madam Speaker, I see that the government really intends to impose such discriminatory treatment on Quebec farmers and that the members of the Quebec caucus, as usual, will again simply put up with such an affront to their constituents.

As a result of these meetings which the minister mentions the Government of Quebec and its agricultural partners have created a coalition to fight this measure. I ask the minister, or rather the one who is answering for the responsible minister: Does he not know that if he continues on that course he will just be taken for a lobbyist for western farmers?

Hon. Pierre Blais (Minister of Justice, Attorney General of Canada and Minister of State (Agriculture)): Madam Speaker, I do not think the hon. member has anything to teach me. I think that I spent more time with his own farmers in the riding of Lac-Saint-Jean than he has over the years.

If ever a government has looked after Quebec farmers to assure them that there were really Quebecers who have their interests at heart here in this Parliament, it is this government. We have taken measures over the years to consult farmers in Quebec and Canada. I think that everyone has admitted that, even the people in the coalition who are still prepared to sit down with us. My colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, and I will look into it. Nothing is definite yet. It is not a bill or a measure that we will force or impose. We will discuss with people and I am sure that in the end people will agree with us. I invite the hon. member to read the document, which obviously he has not done. That is crystal clear.

* * *

[*English*]

CUMBERLAND DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Mr. Bill Casey (Cumberland—Colchester): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Employment and Immigration.

For some months the Cumberland Development Corporation has been applying for an extension of funding for its operation and investment budgets so it can continue its good work in business development and through the SCA program and other programs.

Is that funding coming? If it is coming, when can we expect it?

Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Madam Speaker, because of the good, dedicated, solid, hard work of the member it has been approved and it will be announced shortly.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CREDIT CARDS

Mr. Darryl L. Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and concerns credit cards.

According to a recent survey, 65 per cent of Canadians are in favour of stricter controls on credit card use. The survey would seem to indicate that consumers realize it is very easy to get into debt, especially with credit cards.

What does the Minister intend to do about the excessively high rate of consumer debt?

Hon. Pierre H. Vincent (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Minister of State (Indian Affairs and Northern Development)): Madam Speaker, I am aware of the situation, and even if the opposition is not interested, I think it is a serious issue for Canadian consumers. Recently, a consumer organization in Shawinigan submitted a number of proposals to the department. I have sent some suggestions and comments to my provincial counterparts and I am waiting for a reply so that we may help Canadian consumers deal with this problem.

* * *

[*English*]

POVERTY

Mr. David Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister.

Like my leader, I have great respect for the Minister of Finance, but I am somewhat insulted and appalled today

that the Minister of Finance would not avail himself of the opportunity to stand in his place and repudiate the comments made by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Poverty who said: "Conditions in Atlantic Canada are so bad that Canadians will want to be sending food to the maritimes. It is Third World conditions there".

I want to ask the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance if he agrees with this statement and if not will he repudiate that statement and that member now?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance): Madam Speaker, I want to tell the hon. member that I have not had an opportunity to read—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

• (1500)

Mr. David Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond): Madam Speaker, my supplementary is to the right hon. Prime Minister.

The Prime Minister will know that maritimers are proud people, proud of their culture and proud of the contribution they have made to Canada. In some instances they are proud of the representatives they have sent to this Parliament to serve on behalf of Canada.

Does the Prime Minister agree that there are Third World conditions in Atlantic Canada and that we must send food to the maritimes to keep them afloat? Does the Prime Minister agree with such gobbledegook from the chairman of the Subcommittee on Poverty?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, I have not seen the statement to which my friend refers. I will be happy to read the complete transcript. I have heard from time to time in this House and elsewhere, for example in respect of my area of the country and Atlantic Canada and northern Ontario, many people saying that for example Third World conditions prevailed on native reserves. That in some cases turned out to be accurate. We have had to examine that and re-examine our own consciences to deal with the great problems of Indian reserves and native Canadians, aboriginal Canadians generally. I say that by way of illustration.

For decades, really since Confederation, in spite of every effort Atlantic Canada on a per capita income basis has found itself in a less privileged position than any other area of Canada. There are pockets in Quebec that are worse off and there are pockets in some areas of the prairies that are worse off, but by and large Atlantic Canada has not benefited from Confederation on a per capita basis to the same extent as the rest of Canada. This is why equalization is so important. The federal government has acted through Hibernia and through the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, through the unilateral allocation of a $5 billion contract to the Saint John shipyards, through the building of the fixed link From New Brunswick to Prince Edward Island, in order to provide what maritimers need: equality of opportunity and fairness of treatment.

Now let me tell my hon. friend this, and my hon. friend knows full well what the answer is. Any statement at variance with what I just said—and the greatest respect that we have for the contribution of maritimers and Atlantic Canadians generally to the success of Canada—would of course be unacceptable to me as Prime Minister and to my government. We believe that Atlantic Canada must receive the same degree of attention and concern and investment as anywhere else. Moreover, the government has multiplied its efforts to make sure this takes place, not for reasons of charity but for reasons of dignity and because Atlantic Canadians are entitled to it.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

* * *

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

Madam Deputy Speaker: I wish to draw to members' attention the presence in the gallery of Mr. Vytautas Landsbergis, leader of the opposition of the Lithuanian Seimas.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-62, an act respecting telecommunications, as reported (with amendments) by a subcommittee of the Standing Com-

mittee on Communications and Culture; and Motions Nos. 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22 and 23.

• (1505)

Mr. Jack Whittaker (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt): Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to once again speak on this bill on telecommunications and communications with respect to Motions Nos. 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22 and 23.

Motion No. 12 would delete the exemption power afforded to the CRTC. The power to exempt can also be met through the commission's power to forbear the right—

[*Translation*]

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Could hon. members perhaps carry on their discussions behind the curtains? The Chair cannot hear members speaking on the far side.

The hon. member for Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt.

[*English*]

Mr. Whittaker: As I was saying, the power to exempt can also be met through the commission's power to forbear from regulation or through policy directives under clause 8. Without this amendment the CRTC can exempt an entire class of carriers from regulation. This is an extension of the competition mania gripping the CRTC and the government.

It is interesting to note in legislative committee the comments of the governments of Ontario and British Columbia. The province of Ontario said: "It is considered that the cabinet's power of exemption is excessive and unnecessary. The province of Ontario therefore recommends that clause 9 be deleted from the bill".

The province of British Columbia said: "This section providing the power to exempt should be deleted. The purpose of the provision can be met either through the commission's power to forbear from regulation, or if the intent is to serve broader policy aims the Governor in Council can issue policy directives under clause 8".

We can accomplish already what is set out. The suggestion is that this amendment is to delete the exemption power which is being afforded the CRTC because it is present in another area. The CRTC itself said: "The commission is also strongly of the view that is with the case of policy directives: A matter before the commission should not be subject of an exemption order".

Moving on to Motion No. 13, this amendment would ensure that any and all affected provinces have advance knowledge of any exemption of a class of carrier or other orders that would impact on their province and would ensure that the provinces would have an adequate opportunity to consult with the minister before any public announcement is made.

The government has been extremely reluctant to include any meaningful measure to ensure dialogue between the federal government and its provincial counterparts. This amendment combined with our Motion No. 8 respecting clause 7 would enhance federal–provincial consultations in an area sensitive for several provinces, specifically Saskatchewan, Quebec and Manitoba.

In committee the B.C. government stated as follows in its submission: "Provinces should be advised of a forthcoming proposed order prior to its publication in *The Gazette* notice. Modifications should be referred back to the province under the provincial consultation provisions".

It went on to say that during the negotiation process between the provinces and the federal government to define a memorandum of understanding regarding telecommunications problems and regulations, a proposal was considered for the establishment and functioning of a council for ministers of telecommunications.

This council was (a) to review matters of interest to both orders of government; (b) to consult on major issues that concern both orders of government in the field of telecommunications and; (c) was to consider a policy objective for future telecommunications policy development. Lastly, (d) to exchange information to facilitate future planning for the development of telecommunications policy. Unfortunately these suggestions were not adopted by the government in this piece of legislation.

• (1510)

The next three motions, Nos. 16, 17 and 18, deal with the government's substantial power grab in this bill. The government has the power to issue policy directives to the CRTC as well as vary a CRTC decision, rescind a decision and refer it back to the CRTC. This amendment

would eliminate the vary and rescind power, only allowing cabinet to refer back a decision to the CRTC. The Broadcast Act only allows cabinet to refer back or set aside a decision of the commission, not the more substantial powers to vary or rescind a commission decision.

Once again, the CRTC stated as follows and I quote:

> —if a fence could be built around it—

That is the cabinet's power to vary CRTC decisions.

> —and it were just going to be applied to minor details, that's one thing but we haven't seen any evidence that that's likely to be the case.

The B.C. government in its submission stated and I quote:

> The power to vary or rescind should be reduced to allow the Governor in Council to send a decision back to the CRTC for further review. This would be similar to the power allowed for in the Broadcasting Act.

As we look further at Motion No. 20, the amendment here expands the clause to bind the minister to publish Governor in Council considerations of previous decisions of the CRTC in the *Canada Gazette*. In other words, the cabinet would not be able to refer back, vary or rescind CRTC decisions without some public notice.

If we look at Motion No. 21, this amendment would ensure that the provincial governments are given adequate consultation time when cabinet either issues policy directives or varies or rescinds a CRTC decision.

The next motion is Motion No. 23. This is another power that the government has afforded itself. This would ensure that if the minister is to establish technical standards, he would do so only after consulting not only the CRTC but effective carriers and other interested parties. This amendment would ensure greater transparency of process and more public accountability.

Having looked at all of these amendments, it seems to me that it makes this a fuller bill. As the member for Okanagan—Shuswap has already stated in his remarks, without some of what the people in the legislative committees and some of the witnesses have said, without the incorporation of some of their ideas and some of their suggestions to the legislation, the legislation is not only imperfect but it is far from being adequate for what is necessary at the present time and going further into the 21st century with the massive expansion of telecommunications services and the technology of today.

I close by suggesting very strongly that the minister and the government look at some of the amendments that have been put forward by the member for Okanagan–Shuswap and the member for Mount Royal with respect to trying to make imperfect legislation somewhat more acceptable to all areas within the telecommunications and communications area.

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Saskatoon—Humboldt): Madam Speaker, this series of amendments deals with power the government is taking unto itself and the transparency of the legislation or the ability of the people and the community to see what the government is doing with the power it is taking on. Not surprising, these two are closely related.

• (1515)

A government that is wielding unpopular power to impose unpopular decisions does not want the public to know about it. Quite often this power is wielded undemocratically and in order to further the interests of some particular group in the industry to which the government is beholden. This seems to be the basis of the present bill.

The amendments that are being suggested here are to open up the situation so that the government does not wield quite so much power or at least makes valuable use of the commission it has in place, which is the CRTC.

The provinces have been an important part of the development of the industry. They should be given some negotiating tools. That would mean that they should be allowed to make suggestions and have some tools by which they can force the government to take a look at those things.

One particular amendment to this act suggests that the provinces are not that important in this whole area. Yet if one looks into history the provinces are the most important area. The federal government is late in coming to the area of communications and intercommunications.

Parliament is supposed to be the final authority of government. In Motion No. 12 we are suggesting that the CRTC power be exempt from regulation as an entire class of the industry. This is what is being suggested in this. We are loath to give that kind of power because this

becomes the ultimate deregulation. The government can say: "We will exempt this whole class of the industry from any kind of regulation at all". This puts that particular class into a situation of new regulation and not necessarily doing things for the benefit of the country or of the consumer.

In Motion No. 13 my colleague from Okanagan—Shuswap in an earlier amendment suggested that co-operation between the CRTC, the provinces and the industry should be one of the main aims of the legislation. It would appear that the government has been extremely reluctant to include meaningful measures to ensure dialogue between the federal and the provincial governments.

It would be more logical to put into the legislation a requirement for this kind of recognition of the need for consultation between these particular groups. One of the provinces suggested that a council might be an alternative to the suggestion made in this particular amendment.

Take Motions Nos. 21, 22 and 23. Motion No. 21 is approximately the same as Motion No. 14 which is the motion of exemption. Motion No. 22 would seem to delete the provincial governments as an effective part of the industry and should therefore not be included in the amendments that we would support.

• (1520)

It would appear that in Motion No. 20, which is relative to the power of the cabinet, my colleague has suggested that if cabinet does take power from the CRTC, which is what is being suggested by this particular act, then it should have to at least report what it is doing and make the processes of exemption, deregulation and overriding the wishes of provinces or the industry as transparent as possible.

Each time the CRTC makes a decision this particular motion would require that it be published so that the world could know what is being done in the name of the government to the communications industry.

This group of amendments, as I said earlier, tries to ameliorate the power that is being put upon cabinet and taken away to some extent from the CRTC. It makes the whole process—if it must stay the way it is and that seems likely under these kinds of circumstances—as transparent as possible so that people of Canada within the industry will know that the Governor In Council is imposing upon them something which they do not want, which might be unpopular and might not be acceptable to them.

Mr. Mike Breaugh (Oshawa): Madam Speaker, I wanted to participate in this debate this afternoon because I think this is an important occasion when we look at the communications industry in Canada and look at its special needs and look at the responses that have been brought forward in this legislation and the amendments that are currently grouped before the House.

How the CRTC works is always a great mystery to many Canadians. Even those within the industry struggle sometimes to sort out precisely how the process of regulations actually functions and where the powers lie. Part of what I thought was rather unique in the proposals before us this afternoon was to look at some of the things that governments do by simply not doing anything or by exempting.

I think the first element of these motions before us this afternoon that deserves some consideration is this power of exemption. It is what the government and the CRTC would do simply by exempting certain matters from regulation.

I think for many of us in looking on the surface what appears to be an attempt to bring forward competition does not always achieve its stated aim. There are some matters where realistically in the Canadian market one will get some level of competition but opening it up does not always accomplish that purpose. Very often an exemption or the use of regulations which at least on the surface appears to be some attempt to bring forward competition in the industry does not really do that.

There may be some change or some alteration in the conditions at the beginning of that process but in the long run it is inevitable that that is not really going to bring about competition. That is going to bring about injury to a certain sector of the industry itself.

I think some of the motions before us this afternoon that really deal with the power of exemption need to be examined. It may on the surface appear that the government and the CRTC are not attempting to do much more than make sure that there is competition in the field. These motions do examine and do look at some of the problems we have and deny the reality of this country

which is sometimes a little difficult to fathom because it is a very complicated piece of business.

• (1525)

I want to go through some of the other motions that are before us because I think they deal with what may be considered by many to be a pretty politically sensitive area. That is the way in which the federal government and its agency the CRTC deals with these matters which in many cases blend, sometimes fortunately and sometimes unfortunately, with the concerns that are brought forward by the provincial governments.

Part of what I like about the motions presented here is that an attempt is made to sort out that process. It should not necessarily be an adversarial process all the time. It ought to be a process where it is clear to the provincial governments what the intention is of the federal government and the CRTC. They should at least be given a reasonable amount of notice and provided with an opportunity before decisions are made to participate in that process. That is a power sharing concept which has been addressed in many ways over the years. Sometimes it is looked at in a constitutional sense of delegating powers almost starkly.

However the truth is that in many parts of Canada the powers will be shared. Whether anybody really wants to store these powers or not they are going to have to. The impact of a regulatory agency like the CRTC on the efforts of any of our provincial governments is sometimes very significant.

What these motions try to do is to lay out a process that is fair, reasonable and logical so that we bring together those interests of the federal government and each of our provinces to establish a process that is also fair and reasonable. This provides an opportunity for the provinces to participate in the process, share some of the obligations and at least be knowledgeable and understand this whole regulatory process at work along with, subsequently, the public at large.

Many of us are concerned—it is covered in some of these motions—about the new technology and how it changes the way the communications industry functions in Canada. Many of us have been concerned that there will always be, we hope, a publishing industry that is not uniquely Canadian in terms of the people hired who are born and raised in Canada but that looks on the needs of a country—Canada—as its primary function.

It needs to be published here. It needs to feature Canadian artists. It needs to have a Canadian perspective. It needs to address a Canadian audience. I do not want to say nasty things about American magazines or magazines that come from other parts of the world that serve their purposes quite nicely. Many of us would have an interest in them.

There is a need now to look at the technology which allows an American-made magazine to be published almost instantaneously in Canada. That technology is only one example of many where a technology of the industry is kind of leap-frogging over the regulatory nature of the government.

I think the motions in this group are attempts to try to recognize that this technology is moving very quickly. Even 10 years ago we would not have thought of all kinds of telecommunications as being a driving factor in the publications industry. However now it is. Now whole magazines and layouts can be distributed in Canada and in a technical sense printed in part in Canada and sometimes qualify as Canadian magazines. However, in fact they are about as Canadian as receiving something on a fax machine.

The motions that are before the House at the moment are an attempt to try to sort out the problems that we have encountered in those areas in a logical and rational way.

The last thing I want to try to touch on is the move, which some would say is unfair, by the federal government to change the nature of the CRTC and to establish very clearly the power of the Government of Canada.

This is a fairly substantive change. For years we have argued in this country that what we want with an agency like the CRTC is a regulatory agency which arbitrates disputes, makes regulations and comes to decisions when we need a decision-making body to arbitrate some argument in an industry.

In this bill and in some of the motions that are before us we are attempting to grapple with the relationship of a government with one of its regulatory bodies. I would argue that the changes in the bill go a bit too far for my taste. Rather than setting apart an agency to arbitrate a dispute and come forward with regulations, they allow

the Government of Canada to intervene too broadly to set aside and override those decisions.

• (1530)

That is something we have struggled with in a number of areas in this country over the years. It is sometimes difficult for a government to walk the line between setting policies, letting the policies run and allowing a third party to arbitrate disputes in that particular area. Sometimes governments will cross over the line and in my view this bill crosses over a bit too strongly. It removes some of the powers of the CRTC and changes the nature of the process substantively and not to anybody's particular benefit.

The last area I would mention in my comments on this grouping of motions is an amendment to expand the clause to bind the minister to publish Governor in Council consideration of previous decisions of the CRTC in the *Canada Gazette*. In other words, the cabinet would not be able to refer back or rescind CRTC decisions without some public notice.

It is absolutely amazing and quite contrary to my notion of how a democracy should function exactly how many times that kind of a process happens. Supposedly, public policy decisions are reached on matters the public has the right to be informed about, but they are not. These motions provide a process whereby the public would at least have an access point to that kind of decision-making process.

The motions which have been brought forward by my colleague are eminently supportable and this is an important bill. I regret that we have had a closure motion put on it, but the motions before us in my colleagues' names will help make this a better bill.

Mr. Joe Fontana (London East): Madam Speaker, I too want to speak on Motion No. 22. It deals with clause 13 which is essentially about provincial consultation.

I think sections 8 to 15 of Bill C-62, the telecommunications bill, deal with the powers of Order in Council which essentially lay out the responsibility of the government to this bill and a number of ways the Order in Council should operate from directions, exemptions and so on.

My colleague from Mount Royal has put an amendment that would strike some of the words in clause 13 that speak to provincial consultation. Her amendment would have the federal minister notify his provincial counterparts but it would stop at notification as opposed to clause 13 in the bill in its present form which says: "and shall provide an opportunity for each of them to consult with the minister". In other words, it would build additional bureaucratic layers that might cause the federal Minister of Communications some problems. Those words could be construed as giving a silent veto of some sort to each and every provincial minister when dealing with a telecommunications issue. I think that would be counter-productive.

I applaud the minister for getting this bill to the floor of the House after nine years. It is a very good bill. Constructive amendments have been put forward that have improved it and will lead this country into the 21st century in a very dynamic way. But the whole purpose of this bill is to arrange competitive forces and talk about the roles of government, the CRTC and all the stakeholders in the telecommunications industry in this country.

• (1535)

If the whole spirit of the legislation is to make sure we have good order and good management in telecommunications, it would appear to me that the amendment of my colleague from Mount Royal to strike the words "and shall provide an opportunity for each of them to consult with the minister" is much more favourable and positive. Clause 13 would allow the federal Minister of Communications the assurance that having made those important decisions for the federal government for the good of the country notification of his provincial counterparts would be enough.

Notification also means there would have been a tremendous amount of consultation beforehand. It is not a Draconian phrase that says "will notify" and that is it. The federal minister knows there has to be a co-operative and co-ordinated approach with the provinces in areas of telecommunications. Therefore I think striking those words as my colleague from Mount Royal wants to do would help the federal government discharge its particular duties and responsibilities.

I would ask the House to support this very positive amendment. In my opinion it does not infer any veto or silent veto powers to the provincial ministers but essentially says that notification and consultation is proper. The present wording in clause 13 might infer additional powers or even a silent veto to the provincial ministers. That is not acceptable to us. That is why the amendment has been put forward by my colleague from Mount Royal.

We are very supportive of this amendment and encourage the government and the NDP to support it also.

Mr. Vic Althouse (Mackenzie): Madam Speaker, I rise to spend a few moments defending the grouping of amendments before us.

I believe these amendments are trying to accomplish three things. There are a great many of them and it becomes very difficult to debate each one piece by piece. My colleague from Okanagan—Shuswap and the hon. member for Mount Royal, in one amendment in the grouping, are attempting to make three points that ought to be made when we are discussing telecommunications strategy in this country.

The government has been attempting to find methods of deregulating the industry. It is going to continue with the CRTC. The first clause we are dealing with provides for an exemption from regulation. That may sound like a good thing to some members of the government but from the point of view of the role of the House of Commons in establishing legislation and while it is a continuation of the last eight or nine years of practice in this Chamber, it is not a good practice.

The government has been drafting bills that are as broadly set out as possible and will essentially give the cabinet the right to do whatever it wants within very broad limits in a particular policy area.

The clause we are attempting to take from the legislation would give the cabinet or the CRTC the power to ignore all their rules in the case of a particular company or actor in the telecommunications field. This can be very dangerous for the existing entities in the business and for provincial governments that are already historically and in practice involved in some parts of the telecommunication industry, particularly telephones and the parts of the telecommunication technology attached to telephones that require a system of lines to provide service.

• (1540)

The government, consistent with its policies throughout its mandate has decided to turn over much of these powers and rights to transnational corporations. They can take the more profitable parts of the industry and make a profit from them. An attempt has been made to permit new players into the long distance telephone market which uses microwave technology. It does not require inter-linkages with telephone lines and all the infrastructure that the provincial telephone companies and the existing companies in the larger provinces where they are not government-owned have already established some very heavy investments.

I have seen problems that can arise in another aspect of telecommunications in my own riding. The CRTC appeared to give one company the right to broadcast in a rather small part of the vast territory of my constituency. It only extended to a few small villages. Then a decision was made several years later to introduce competition to this same small area. Probably 99.99 per cent of my territory does not have any of these services but in the .01 per cent that does, the CRTC decided there should be competition.

The existing broadcaster communicator was making no money at all. He was losing money but was hopeful that if he carried on for another couple of years he would be able to break even. Now he has competition and two companies are busily losing money as fast as they can. What a coup for political ideology. What a stupid kind of public policy.

The right to exempt the second company from the rules that were there for the first company seems to have been at the root of the problem. It can happen even in very small villages and out of the way communities such as the ones I represent. This kind of policy can wreak a great deal of harm.

It is further aggravated because the decision-making process is not documented and cannot be found nor traced. We simply get the decisions without the rationales for the decisions. That is something else these amendments are attempting to correct in this changed legislation.

These are important. The amendments themselves may not have the ideas set out as elegantly as would have been the case had my friend for Okanagan—Shuswap been able to draft the whole of the legislation. According to the rules, he must work with the existing somewhat

flawed legislation and try to make a silk purse out of a sow's ear as it were.

Essentially these amendments will go some way toward achieving the kinds of things I spoke about. They are worthy of support and I recommend them to the House.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

• (1545)

Madam Deputy Speaker: The first question is on Motion No. 12. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

Madam Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Madam Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 13. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

Madam Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Madam Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 16. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

Madam Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Madam Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 17. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

Madam Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Madam Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 18. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

Madam Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Madam Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 21. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

Madam Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

• (1550)

Madam Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 23. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

Madam Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Madam Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

Mr. MacWilliam: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I just want to point out that inadvertently the Speaker neglected to put Motion No. 22 standing in the name of my Liberal colleague from Mount Royal. It should be put to the House and voted upon accordingly.

Madam Deputy Speaker: I cannot put Motion No. 22 to the House until the House has decided on Motion No. 21. That will happen later today.

An affirmative vote on Motion No. 21 obviates the question being put on Motion No. 22. As the House has decided to defer the vote on Motion No. 21 I cannot put Motion No. 22 to the House.

Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (Okanagan—Shuswap) moved:

Motion No. 24.

That Bill C-62 be amended in Clause 19 by striking out line 15 at page 10 and substituting the following therefor:

"19.(1) The Commission may, on application,".

Motion No. 25.

That Bill C-62 be amended in Clause 19 by striking out line 21 at page 10 and substituting the following therefor:

"Commission considers are consistent with the".

Motion No. 26.

That Bill C-62 be amended in Clause 19 by striking out line 31 at page 10 and substituting the following therefor:

"Commission."

Motion No. 27.

That Bill C-62 be amended in Clause 20 by striking out line 32 at page 10 and substituting the following therefor:

"20.(1) Commission may suspend or revoke".

Motion No. 28.

That Bill C-62 be amended in the English version, in Clause 20 by striking out line 34 at page 10 and substituting the following therefor:

"whenever the Commission believes on reasonable".

Motion No. 29.

That Bill C-62 be amended in the English version, in Clause 20 by striking out line 42 at page 10 and substituting the following therefor:

"Commission."

Motion No. 30.

That Bill C-62 be amended in Clause 20 by striking out line 1 at page 11 and substituting the following therefor:

"(2) The Commission may suspend or revoke on".

He said: Madam Speaker, although the motions seem minor in the actual wording because they basically change a single term in each of the various motions, they have a fairly major ramification.

There was extensive debate during committee stage with regard to ministerial licensing power. The original bill had a fairly extensive series of clauses in it referring to ministerial licensing power with respect to domestic licensing.

After very extensive discussion in legislative committee with members of the CRTC, members of the industry, ministry staff and our legal counsel who was present, we were successful at striking these provisions from the bill. The ministry was in accordance with that direction. Obviously it must have been because these particular provisions were struck.

• (1555)

However clauses 19 and 20 remain, allowing for a ministerial licensing power with respect to the licensing of international submarine cable licences. The various subsections of clauses 19 and 20 refer repeatedly to the ministerial power or the granting of the power of licensing to the minister. To be consistent with the provisions that struck the ministerial licensing power with respect to domestic licensing it was felt at least by myself and my colleagues that rather than have the minister actually grant application for the issuance of international submarine cable licences to corporations eligible to hold licences, the provision should more adequately be within the powers of the commission.

The amendments would look at changing the delegation of power from that of the minister to that of the commission. We simply felt that the commission was a body struck through this Parliament, a body with responsibility for issuance of licences and the reviewing of licences with respect to the domestic situation.

We felt it would be most appropriate to utilize that body or that commission, which is at arm's length from cabinet and from the minister, as the appropriate vehicle to make the decisions as to whether international cable licences should or should not be given.

The change is very minor in the wording but fairly major in terms of the ramifications of where the power to make these decisions actually rests. We are simply saying that power should more adequately reside with the commission rather than with the minister. That would be within the spirit of the changes that have already been made, the changes respecting ministerial licensing with which the government has seen fit to agree.

That is the reason for the recommendations. I hope the government considers them. We think they are appropriate recommendations and amendments to make.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal): Madam Speaker, I agree with my colleague that it would be sensible if all licensing powers are to be taken from the minister in sections 18, 19, 20, 21 and 22 to do the same in this section also. That way our action will be more logically coherent. That is why I think that this motion presented by my colleague is worth considering seriously.

[*English*]

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

Madam Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 24 and the vote applies to Motions Nos. 25 to 30. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: No.

Some hon. members: On division.

Motion No. 24 negatived.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Accordingly Motions Nos. 25, 26, 27, 28, 29 and 30 are negatived on division.

Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (Okanagan—Shuswap) moved:

Motion No. 31.

That Bill C-62 be amended in Clause 27 by adding immediately after line 22 at page 15 the following:

"(5) Where the Commission has determined that unjust commercial practices have occurred, the Commission shall intervene to ensure the restoration of healthy rules of competition consistent with the Canadian telecommunications policy objectives."

• (1600)

He said: Madam Speaker, I must admit it is rather hard. With the number of amendments we have before us we sometimes get a little bit behind the game but I think we are caught up here.

This particular motion with respect to clause 27 arose with respect to a concern that some of the players, not major players in the industry but certainly significant players, have expressed with respect to the assurances of just commercial practices.

This amendment would provide a level of additional assurance that would grant the CRTC, as the commissioning body, the power to intervene in bona fide cases in which it feels unjust commercial practices have been entered into. The reason for granting that provision of assurance and the power for the CRTC would be to allow it to intervene in such situations to restore what could be considered healthy rules of competition.

This amendment was debated briefly in legislative committee but it was perhaps overlooked because of some of the more wide-sweeping amendments that were introduced both by the government and the opposition members in the legislative committee.

It was only afterward in reviewing some of the loose ends that remain within this legislation that I took a look at this section and realized that the arguments made by Fonorola in its brief of May 5 and its recommendation that this particular consideration be provided in this section of the legislation was a just one. It would simply act to ensure that in the future if any such abusive actions in terms of unjust commercial practices were entered into they would not be condoned or overlooked by our regulatory body.

In light of the fact that this bill is thrusting us into a new era of deregulation and is opening up the competitive aspect of the telecommunications marketplace I think that all the players in the industry would like to assure themselves that when that competition is opened up it will be fair competition and there will not be predatory practices or unfair trade practices in any layer of that competition.

There is a particular concern about the difference in size of some of these competitive players. Some of these players in the industry are pretty big time. There is Bell Canada, B.C. Tel on the west coast, and some of the big telecoms. Some of the U.S. interests are coming in and joining with our Canadian interests, such as with Unitel and AT&T. These are very major players in the industry. There are some very minor players in the industry that want to assure themselves that they are not going to be simply swallowed up by possible unfair or unjust trade practices.

In light of those concerns and the fact that we have seen the impact of predatory pricing and policies in other industrial sectors and the impacts that those policies can have, I thought it was only appropriate to provide this level of assurance for our smaller players in the industry to make sure that when competition is entered into it is fair competition, just competition and balanced competition.

Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal): Madam Speaker, I recognize this amendment. It is the Fonorola amendment. I would suggest that at the time it was submitted it was an important consideration. Thanks to Fonorola a lot of the issues around an assurance for just and reasonable rates were looked into.

We deal with just and reasonable rates in section 27. Now it is referred to in section 27.3, something that was not previously referred to. We have to refer back to section 25 and section 29 with respect to how this bill is applied, and with any decisions now found under sections 24, 25 and 29 they have added section 34.

• (1605)

Section 34, which comes after integral activities, makes sure that all matters are taken into account and all business activities are taken into account. A lot of the predatory concerns that were legitimate have been answered.

In a sense one could say that it is a redundant amendment. On the other hand, one could say that it never hurts to assure that what is implicit is made explicit. I once said in committee that it could almost be seen as chicken soup, now that we are at this it cannot hurt.

Mr. Beatty: Unless you're a chicken.

Mrs. Finestone: That is true. It is a matter of the chicken and the egg, whether we have a full commitment or a partial one. Is that not so?

As for the question of the David and Goliath scenario that this bill has to address, where we have the smaller hybrid companies and/or smaller telecommunications services versus the giants in the field then just and reasonable rates are fundamental. Of course that is the responsibility of the CRTC.

However there are potential possibilities for change in this area. Section 27(1) says that:

> Every rate charged by a Canadian carrier for a telecommunications service shall be just and reasonable.

This gives the industry that perceives damage another clause on which to hang its hat.

Therefore I do not think this could hurt and I do not think it would be offensive in any sense to the procedure in the bill. It just makes explicit what perhaps is perceived to be implicit in this bill.

Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, this is just a test on my part to verify whether the assumption I made is correct that up until now those motions on which I have intervened have tended to take longer and been more difficult when I have been dealing with my friends. When I did not intervene the last five or six motions rushed right through with no difficulty.

I will watch with great care to see what sort of reaction there is as I try to be helpful here. However I do want to indicate to my hon. friend that I certainly share his concern that in cases where deregulation takes place we have to ensure that there is full and fair competition. I can give him the assurance, however, that the CRTC already has the power to correct abuses by the carriers which it regulates through its present authority to approve or deny tariff applications and agreements between carriers.

The CRTC also has the authority to investigate abuses in those instances where it uses its forbearance or exemption powers. I would also note that the amendment is cast in very broad language that would appear to extend well into the area of responsibility given to the director of investigation and research under the Competition Act.

I can give my hon. friend the assurance that full power already exists in the act to achieve the goals that he is seeking to achieve here.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): In my opinion the nays have it.

Some hon. members: On division.

Motion No. 31 negatived.

Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (Okanagan—Shuswap) moved:

Motion No. 32

That Bill C-62 be amended in clause 34 by striking out line 11 at page 18 and substituting the following therefor:

"tions policy objectives and in the public interest to do so.

(1.1) Before acting under subsection (1), the commission shall give notice of any proposed forbearance by publication in *Canada Gazette* of the power that it proposes not exercising or the duty that it proposes not performing and the reasons supporting the proposed forbearance and, no sooner than 30 days following publication of the notice, shall hold a public hearing to enable interested parties to intervene for purposes of demonstrating that the proposed forbearance is not in the public interest".

Motion No. 34

That Bill C-62 be amended in clause 34 by striking out line 17 at page 18 and substituting the following therefor:

"of users, the commission may make a deter—".

• (1610)

He said: Mr. Speaker, the whole question of forbearance took up a fairly significant amount of time in the legislative committee given the time that we did have to take it up. There was quite a bit of debate on this. There

were some legitimate and outstanding concerns about the process of forbearance and where to forbear, or to choose not to regulate if we want to clarify the terms. The whole issue is still quite a problem.

The two amendments that I have suggested go somewhat toward making this a little more in the realm of a discretionary decision by the CRTC. This particular clause allows the regulatory commission to forbear, or to decide not to regulate, virtually any part of the telecommunications service or industry where it finds that to refrain would be consistent with Canadian telecommunication policy objectives. That is basically the essence of the amendment. It is to forbear where it is consistent with the policy objectives outlined in the objectives of the bill itself.

I think we want to ensure there is in fact a means test, not only with respect to whether or not there is sufficient competition taking place so that the CRTC could withdraw from its regulatory role, but it is just as important for there to be a means of deciding whether in fact it would be consistent and in the long-term interests of Canadians—meaning Canadian consumers and Canadian users—as well as the industry itself.

With the way the bill is currently worded I do not feel it provides the kinds of assurances that would be provided for with this amendment; that is to refrain when consistent with the policy objectives and not consistent with just one objective. That objective would obviously be whether there is sufficient competition in the industry. However, is it consistent with the other policy objectives? It should be in the interests of Canadian users of our telecommunications services and consistent with the social policy objectives of this piece of legislation.

The clause in the bill demands that the CRTC should forbear from regulation when competition is sufficient in the market. The way it is worded essentially forces the CRTC to do that. The decision of whether it might do it, may do it or shall do it is pretty clear in this particular clause.

In the clause as currently worded it shall do it and has no discretion. What I am saying is that perhaps we should provide the regulatory body the choice and to allow them to have that flexibility in choosing when to and when not to forbear or to decide to move away from a regulatory structure. Give them the choice in doing so and therefore protect the public interest. Rather than being as restrictive as it is currently written *vis-à-vis* in saying that the commission shall forbear, it allows some flexibility.

I would like to put forward those amendments. I think it is certainly in the best interests of the industry and the Canadian public to allow that kind of flexibility for the commission to decide when and when not to exercise this particular option.

• (1615)

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Saskatoon—Humboldt): Mr. Speaker, sometimes it would appear that the term or the idea of public interest is a forgotten concept, particularly with governments that are rushing untrammelled to be competitive or to appear to be competitive. Consequently these two amendments are an attempt to allow the CRTC to take public interest into consideration when it decides whether or not it is going to regulate the industry or portions of the industry.

The first amendment would add that the public interest is a crucial factor in the decision not to regulate sections of the industry. The second amendment would allow the CRTC flexibility in choosing when not to forbear from regulating therefore giving further protection to the public interest. In both cases the basis under which decisions to regulate are made will be whether or not it is in the public interest to do so.

We all recognize that a considerable number of situations arise where competition is detrimental to the best operation of the industry. I can give a very simple example. If there is no requirement or regulation to provide communications to certain areas which are not profitable then there is a tendency for a government to say: "Do not bother".

We have grown up in a large country with fairly costly communications problems believing that every area of the country should have the right to adequate communications. Competition would not provide this kind of communication. Therefore it is required to establish some sort of regulations which do put into place a structure which enforces to some extent regulations to say that the industry must provide this communication over the whole of the country rather than only in those areas that are profitable.

That is the kind of public interest that needs to be taken into consideration and that is what these two amendments are intended to do. They will give the CRTC the right to make a choice to say that in the public interest regulation should be put into place or regulation should not be put into place. That is the basis of these two which would strengthen the ability of the CRTC to rule in the public interest.

Mr. Mike Breaugh (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, this particular set of motions kind of goes to the crux of this bill. I know it is fashionable in many parts of the industry to talk about deregulation. I know that it is fashionable when this government in particular sets its mind to drafting legislation to come up with new terminology that somehow manages to obfuscate the issue and confuse people so that no one at the end of the day actually knows what is going on.

The motions that are before the House at the moment tend to do that. They talk about forbearance and we are all not terribly sure what that is.

• (1620)

The government is saying: "When in doubt confuse them and change the title". It is doing that. In this section of the bill and under these particular motions it is simply saying it wants to deregulate whether or not anybody needs it, wants it or it is in the public interest. It believes in deregulation and as the government it manages to force that on everybody else.

One ought to have these arguments in a political philosophy class at a university but here in the House of Commons we are supposed to deal with the problems of a nation and not a political philosophy. I urge those who advocate deregulation as a wonderful thing to visit an American airport these days and find their luggage. It is almost at that stage in Canadian airports.

Deregulation in my view may have some merit here and there. I would certainly give a good argument on that but it is not an all-encompassing solution for the world's problems. These two motions try to sort out when we would allow something to be totally deregulated. When would public interest dictate and not competition in the marketplace? That is something people in the private sector have to worry about every day.

People look to governments to decide whether to regulate when something needs to be done in the interest of the public at large. That is when it does its intervening. People are not really looking forward to one more occasion when a government can ignore what ought to be done simply by saying it believes in deregulation of the marketplace. This denies the practical reality in many parts of this country that without some kind of government intervention people in certain parts of Canada will not have access to a marketplace that is readily available to other Canadians.

The government is in love with words like deregulation and competition but the reality is that much of this country requires a little help from the government to exist. In the broadest possible sense the world's technology is here now. That explosion is already well under way in Canada as it is in every other country in the world. To say the government's role is to simply deregulate and get out of the road is nonsense and the government really ought to know that. It ought to really understand that if we want to maintain a viable communications industry in this country it needs to have some clear policy directives from the government at large and some sensible regulatory agencies put in place to ensure that there is fairness in the marketplace and not just competition.

Perhaps a little while ago Canadians would have been susceptible to the old argument that all we really need is some competition in the marketplace and we will be all right. I think Canadians all across this country are getting used to the idea that the buzz-words of competition and deregulation sometimes mean we do not have any choice a little further down the line.

They are realizing there is a legitimate role for government to play in this. It is not to stand back and watch the competition cut each another up until there is no provision for service. It is not to stand back and watch some multinational giant move in and wipe out all the jobs in any of our sectors. It is not to leave the scene of the crime when it comes to something as vital as communications.

These two motions are worthy of the consideration of the House and show the basic direction the government is trying to set with this bill. It wants to get out of the way and let people make a whole lot of money. That is not a sin in itself but it is a sin if Canadians are deprived of

services they deserve, the right to work for a living and the right to be part of this society.

That is what this government is trying to do with this bill. That is what these two motions try to deal with.

• (1625)

Mr. Jack Whittaker (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt): Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a couple of things on record that in trying to become familiar with this bill are of some concern to me—I have been involved in the committee set up a year and a half ago—with respect to the budget of 1992. That committee looked at three departments and the deregulation of those departments.

My friend from Oshawa has discussed the deregulation of the transportation industry and some of the difficulties we have had there. Just recently we have witnessed the involvement of Unitel in the area of telecommunications. It has moved into the telephone service area and is causing major problems.

In some areas of my home province of British Columbia telephone companies recently applied to the CRTC for an interim rate increase for domestic telephone services. That was refused. Late last week they made an application for a fairly substantial increase in domestic telephone service for private users as opposed to commercial users.

Over the last couple of years we have put petitions before the House of Commons and committees about the problems that have been seen in other areas where there has been deregulation of telephone services. It always seems to get to a level where there are major cost factors involved for the private user.

B.C. Tel has already asked for a substantial increase in rates because of the deregulation of the telephone industry within that province. I am sure the same thing will happen with Bell Telephone in the province of Ontario and the other telephone suppliers such as SaskTel of Saskatchewan and other suppliers across Canada. That seems to be the problem when we look at deregulation.

When I look at this bill I ask where we are going and in what direction. Are we looking at a people first policy or the almighty competition first policy? I think the people of Canada are looking for a policy that is fair to people as opposed to a policy that adds dollars to the corporate coffers. I think that is something we have to look at.

We have to look at whether the public interest is properly represented in each of the amendments before us. Clause 34 throws the industry open to competition as opposed to looking at what is in the best interest of the Canadian people as a whole.

The member for Okanagan—Shuswap has put forward Motion No. 32 which would add the public interest as a crucial factor in a decision to deregulate sections of the industry. Public interest is so important that it is often overlooked by the government in legislation it puts forward. It seems to simply ignore the fact that there are people out there who do not want certain things to happen within the industries. The major pressure of 75 or 80 per cent of the people is often ignored or overlooked when we are making final decisions.

I would emphasize once again that public interest is a crucial factor in any piece of legislation and should be looked at. Therefore I think this amendment is crucial in looking at the over-all legislation.

• (1630)

Motion No. 34 is also an important motion because it allows flexibility for the CRTC to look at whether it should get in and regulate rather than simply, if there is a sufficient market and if the market forces seem to bear up, ignoring public interest and simply allowing things to go as they will.

This one allows some flexibility for the CRTC to choose whether it should regulate or not and whether it should protect the public interest. That also is an important factor and I would certainly commend it to the minister and the government. It must not and should not ever forget the public interest factor in looking at any of the legislation or the regulation of any industry.

Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, I want to take just a few moments to discuss this matter because I showed great restraint as three or four separate members of the NDP stood up to give long-winded statements.

I say to my friend from Oshawa that his constituents who are watching him closely, the key constituents he knows well and who are trying to decide what to do in the next election will be gravely disappointed in the intervention that he made.

I do want to comment for a couple of minutes with regard to Motions Nos. 32 and 34 and particularly with regard to the principle of forbearance. I listened with great interest to my friends from the NDP talking about their concern for the public interest here and how once again this nefarious government was simply reacting to the corporate agenda and doing what was good for corporations without having concern for the people.

Why do we want to have forbearance? We want to give the CRTC the ability to decide that the public interest requires that it not regulate in a particular interest and that the marketplace can do the job more effectively.

A classic case of that is on many issues related to cellular telephones. We have found that as a result of competition consumers have been much better served. We have found a much higher degree of penetration than anybody had anticipated at this point. We have found that the extension of the cellular networks is much broader than anyone could have anticipated at this point. We have found that rates are better and the range of consumer services are much greater than they otherwise would have been as a direct result of the marketplace doing its job.

I must confess to my friends from the NDP that there is something that rings a little bit false when I hear them talking about protecting large corporations from the marketplace as being in the public interest. The position on this side is that it is not our goal to protect a particular corporation but it is our goal to ensure that the public interest is respected. It is our goal to ensure that consumers have choices.

The NDP takes the position that there should be no choice. My friend from Oshawa takes the position that it is all right for people to have any car they want as long as it is black but they cannot have variety. In the view of the NDP consumers should not be allowed to choose because this threatens the position of some of the established monopoly companies today.

Our approach is quite different from that. We say the consumer should be king. Consumers should be given the opportunity to make decisions about how they want their service provided to them. That freedom of choice in the marketplace is something that serves all Canadians.

The bizarre thing today is that it is against the law for the CRTC to forbear from regulating. It is against the law for the CRTC to say that because there is competition in the marketplace and because the marketplace is far more flexible than regulation would be then it should be allowed to not regulate and allow consumers to take their own decisions in the marketplace.

This is crazy. This is something that desperately needs to be changed and we should be moving much more to the marketplace to give consumers that choice, to ensure competition, to encourage new services to come on, to ensure that rates come down as quickly as possible and to ensure that technological innovations take place. That is the position of the CRTC, consumers across Canada and the Government of Canada. It is only the New Democratic Party that believes that Canadian consumers should be deprived of this choice which is so important to them.

• (1635)

Let us take a look at the motions themselves. Motion No. 32 does not change the basic elements of the forbearance process in the bill but it does elaborate on the commission's process. Essentially it is written in a very negative sense and requires the CRTC to hold a public hearing only for the purpose of holding objections to a proposed forbearance which hardly seems very democratic.

The proposed amendment should be rejected since it would tend to increase the cost of regulation for both the CRTC and for the companies that it regulates. These costs are passed on to the consumers.

We hear from the hon. crocodiles opposite as they shed their tears about their concerns for the taxpayers of Canada. We hear about their concerns for the consumers of Canada. Yet what do they propose? They propose to put in as cumbersome a procedure as possible to ensure that the costs to consumers are driven up and to ensure that the regulatory burden upon Canadian taxpayers continues to increase with Canadian taxpayers being asked to foot the bill. All of this is in the name allegedly of the public interest and the consumer.

How are consumers benefited by demanding that they carry these extra costs? Surely they are not. The forbearance powers in clause 34 are strongly supported by the

CRTC, the carriers and by business users. The Senate committee recommended that the forbearance clause be amended to create a presumption in favour of forbearance where effective competition exists. The amendments approved by the House of Commons committee adopt that recommendation.

The Ontario and British Columbia governments also supported the concept of forbearance provided that the commission has a public proceeding when considering forbearance. The CRTC's normal practice is to have a public proceeding particularly with respect to important issues. I have no doubt that it will continue to follow this practice when considering whether it should forebear in the future.

What would be achieved by the amendments that are proposed by my hon. friends? It would only be more bureaucracy, more cost for consumers and a more cumbersome system of regulation. It is one which is not desired by the CRTC, the companies who are the service providers, the consumers and the vast majority of members of Parliament who want to ensure that the public interest is fully protected here.

I implore my friends in the NDP to listen to reason just for one brief, fleeting moment in their parliamentary lives and to put the interests of consumers first. Do not impose this extra burden upon government and upon taxpayers and consumers. Allow the market place to do its job. They should say to their constituents that they trust the judgment of their constituents and that given a free choice they believe their constituents will make the right choice. This is instead of simply standing up once again to protect the position of protected monopolies and to say that competition should not be allowed to serve consumers.

With every opportunity they get my friends in the NDP simply defend the large, monopolistic corporations always at the expense of the consumers. The time has come when my friends in the NDP should put their constituents first and should roll back some of this burden on them and respect their freedom of choice. If they would do that they would see that these motions which they propose are destructive to the public interest.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): The question is on Motion No. 32. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

• (1640)

The next question is on Motion No. 34. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

Before calling the next motions, it is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment

are as follows: the hon. member for Winnipeg North—AIDS; the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Immigration; the hon. member for Cumberland—Colchester—Fisheries; the hon. member for Bonavista—Trinity—Conception—Armed forces; and the hon. member for Mount Royal—Poverty.

[*English*]

Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal) moved:

Motion No. 35.

That Bill C-62 be amended in Clause 41

(a) by striking out line 1 on page 22 and substituting the following:

"41.(1) The Commission may, by order, prohib-"; and

(b) by adding immediately after line 8 on page 22 the following:

"(2) For purposes of subsection (1), "unsolicited telecommunications" means any unsolicited telecommunication that includes an offer to the recipient that is of a commercial nature."

She said: Mr. Speaker, we are looking at one aspect of the telecommunications bill to address the issue of unsolicited telecommunications, in particular telecommunications which can reach us through our fax machines as well as over our telephones. The government has used clause 41 to prohibit or to help through regulation the control of these unsolicited telecommunications. I am fully in accord with this move.

There are two aspects to this. In essence there is the legitimate use of the fax machine and the telephone which may seem to be unwarranted and an intrusion upon the household. They are the kinds of things we have been watching as the Progressive Conservative party in its selection of a new leader has polls and *les sondages* undertaken. We are asking a question, not in the interests of a purchase, but in the interest of soliciting or finding some kind of information that could be of importance. That is to be excluded from the regulations.

The other is the whole question of telemarketing. Many of the telemarketers have very good rules and regulations for themselves and they stay within the bounds of good behaviour. There are those who have abused this privilege, flooding our fax machines at great cost to individuals and to businesses, blocking access to this open line. They are also sending messages which are not what we would consider really receivable such as sex messages, hate messages, pornographic pictures, et cetera.

The question before us in looking at this was how to find some wording which would help avoid confusion and the potential prohibition by the CRTC between these two competing interests which we are addressing in looking at unsolicited telecommunications.

When we are talking about unwanted commercial products which we find in telemarketing, that should find its place within this bill with much greater clarity. It is for this reason I have suggested an addition to clause 41 that would define this whole issue with far greater clarity, adding to the bill for the purposes of the goal of controlling through the CRTC or giving the commission the ability to handle unsolicited telecommunications. Unsolicited telecommunications means any unsolicited telecommunications, which includes an offer to the recipient that is of a commercial nature.

I know that a lot of people are not very pleased when polling experts call their homes. They find it an invasion of their privacy. It is a disruption sometimes at meal times and they are not particularly appreciative of that aspect of unsolicited telephone calls.

In the interest of democracy those are not invaluable services. I think they have a place at a certain time in the course of the history of the country, not all times, and I certainly think there are regulations that are required. In this instance I think it could be very helpful to be more clear about what we are talking about.

• (1645)

We had a great discussion in committee about the implications of unsolicited telephone calls. The issue was the sex lines or the hot sex lines on the 1-976 phone numbers. There is no one forcing anyone to use them but they are enticing in a sense to certain types of people, particularly young children who have been abusing the invitation to use this line and run up excessive telephone bills.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but it being 4.45 p.m., pursuant to order adopted earlier today and in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 78(3), it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith

all questions necessary to dispose of the report stage of the bill now before the House.

The question is on Motion No. 35. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 37. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): In my opinion the nays have it.

Some hon. members: On division.

Motion No. 37 negatived.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): The next question is on Motion No. 43. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 42. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): In my opinion the nays have it.

Some hon. members: On division.

Motion No. 42 negatived.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): The next question is on Motion No. 44. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

• (1650)

[*English*]

Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (Okanagan—Shuswap) moved:

Motion No. 45.

That Bill C-62 be amended by deleting Clause 121.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (Okanagan—Shuswap) moved:

Motion No. 46.

That Bill C-62 be amended by deleting Clause 122.

Motion No. 47.

That Bill C-62 be amended by deleting Clause 123.

Motion No. 48.

That Bill C-62 be amended by deleting Clause 124.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt these motions?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): All those in favour of these motions will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motions stand deferred.

[*Translation*]

It seems the Chair has made a mistake. I should have put Motions Nos. 49 and 50 at the same time as Motion No. 44. The vote taken on Motion No. 44 has the effect of deferring the division on Motions Nos. 49 and 50 but they must nevertheless be put to the House.

[*English*]

Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal) moved:

Motion No. 49.

That Bill C-62 be amended in Clause 125 by striking out lines 10 to 12 on page 45 and substituting the following:

"125. Section 11, other than subsection 11(2), and section 12 to 14 of the said Act are repealed."

Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (Okanagan—Shuswap) moved:

Motion No. 50.

That Bill C-62 be amended by deleting Clause 125.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred divisions on Bill C-62, an act respecting telecommunications.

The first vote will be on the amendment to Motion No. 2.

Call in the members.

The House divided on the amendment, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 509*)

YEAS

Members

Althouse	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Benjamin	Black
Bouchard (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Breaugh

Butland	Duceppe
Heap	Hovdebo
Karpoff	Kindy
Kristiansen	Langan (Mission—Coquitlam)
MacWilliam	Mitchell
Nystrom	Parker
Plamondon	Riis
Rocheleau	Taylor
Tremblay (Rosemont)	Venne
Whittaker	Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—26

NAYS

Members

Allmand	Anderson
Andre	Arseneault
Atkinson	Attewell
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Baker
Beatty	Bélair
Bellemare	Belsher
Berger	Bernier
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Bjornson	Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blais	Blenkarn
Bosley	Bouchard (Roberval)
Boudria	Brightwell
Browes	Caccia
Cadieux	Casey
Chadwick	Chartrand
Clancy	Clark (Yellowhead)
Clark (Brandon—Souris)	Clifford
Cole	Comuzzi
Cooper	Corbeil
Corbett	Côté
Couture	Crawford
Danis	Darling
de Cotret	Della Noce
Desjardins	Dingwall
Dionne	Dobbie
Domm	Dorin
Duhamel	Duplessis
Epp	Fee
Feltham	Ferguson
Ferland	Finestone
Flis	Fontaine
Fontana	Foster
Fretz	Friesen
Gagliano	Gibeau
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Gray (Windsor West)
Greene	Grey (Beaver River)
Guarnieri	Guilbault
Halliday	Harb
Harvard	Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hawkes	Hicks
Hockin	Hogue
Holtmann	Horner
Horning	Hughes
James	Jelinek
Johnson	Joncas
Jordan	Jourdenais
Kempling	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Koury	Landry
Langlois	Lee
Lewis	Littlechild
MacAulay	MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacDougall (Timiskaming—French River)	MacLaren
Maheu	Malone
Manley	Marchi
Marin	Marleau
Martin (Lasalle—Émard)	Martin (Lincoln)
Masse	Mazankowski
McCreath	McDermid
McKnight	McLean
Merrithew	Mifflin
Milliken	Mitges
Monteith	Moore
Nault	Nicholson
Oberle	O'Kurley
Ouellet	Pagtakhan
Paproski	Parent
Peterson	Phinney
Plourde	Porter
Pronovost	Proud
Redway	Reid
Reimer	Ricard
Richardson	Rideout
Roy-Arcelin	Saint-Julien
Schneider	Shields
Siddon	Sobeski
Sparrow	Speller
Stevenson	Tardif
Tétreault	Thacker
Thompson	Thorkelson
Tobin	Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt	Van De Walle
Vankoughnet	Vézina
Vien	Vincent
Wappel	Wenman
Wilbee	
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)	Winegard
	Worthy—174

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anawak	Bourgault
Gaffney	Hopkins
Hudon	Karygiannis
Layton	Walker
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)	

• (1720)

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): I declare the amendment lost.

The next question is on the main motion.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The House divided on Motion No. 2 which was negatived on the following division:

Government Orders

(Division No. 510)

YEAS

Members

Allmand	Althouse
Arseneault	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Baker
Bélair	Bellemare
Benjamin	Berger
Bevilacqua	Black
Bouchard (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Boudria
Breaugh	Butland
Caccia	Clancy
Comuzzi	Crawford
Dingwall	Dionne
Duceppe	Duhamel
Ferguson	Finestone
Flis	Fontana
Foster	Gagliano
Gauthier	Gray (Windsor West)
Grey (Beaver River)	Guarnieri
Harb	Harvard
Heap	Hovdebo
Jordan	Karpoff
Keyes	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Kindy
Kristiansen	Langan (Mission—Coquitlam)
Lee	MacAulay
MacLaren	MacWilliam
Maheu	Manley
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (Lasalle—Émard)	Mifflin
Milliken	Mitchell
Nault	Nowlan
Nystrom	Ouellet
Pagtakhan	Parent
Parker	Peterson
Phinney	Plamondon
Proud	Rideout
Riis	Rocheleau
Speller	Taylor
Tobin	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Venne	Wappel
Whittaker	Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—80

NAYS

Members

Anderson	Andre
Atkinson	Attewell
Beatty	Belsher
Bernier	Bertrand
Bjornson	Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blais	Blenkarn
Bosley	Bouchard (Roberval)
Brightwell	Browes
Cadieux	Casey
Chadwick	Chartrand
Clark (Yellowhead)	Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Clifford	Cole
Cooper	Corbeil
Corbett	Côté
Couture	Danis
Darling	de Cotret
Della Noce	Desjardins
Dobbie	Domm
Dorin	Duplessis
Epp	Fee
Feltham	Ferland
Fontaine	Fretz
Friesen	Gibeau
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Greene
Guilbault	Halliday
Harvey (Chicoutimi)	Hawkes
Hicks	Hockin
Hogue	Holtmann
Horner	Horning
Hughes	James
Jelinek	Johnson
Joncas	Jourdenais
Kempling	Koury
Landry	Langlois
Lewis	Littlechild
MacDonald (Rosedale)	MacDougall (Timiskaming—French River)
Malone	Marin
Martin (Lincoln)	Masse
Mazankowski	McCreath
McDermid	McKnight
McLean	Merrithew
Mitges	Monteith
Moore	Nicholson
Oberle	O'Kurley
Paproski	Plourde
Porter	Pronovost
Redway	Reid
Reimer	Ricard
Richardson	Roy-Arcelin
Saint-Julien	Schneider
Shields	Siddon
Sobeski	Sparrow
Stevenson	Tardif
Tétreault	Thacker
Thompson	Thorkelson
Tremblay (Québec-Est)	Valcourt
Van De Walle	Vankoughnet
Vézina	Vien
Vincent	Wenman
Wilbee	
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)	Winegard
	Worthy—122

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anawak	Bourgault
Gaffney	Hopkins
Hudon	Karygiannis
Layton	McDougall (St. Paul's)
Walker	Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)

• (1725)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): I declare the motion lost.

Mr. Gagliano: Mr. Speaker, I believe that you will find unanimous consent to apply the result of the division just recorded on Motion No. 2 to Motions Nos. 6, 7, 8, 11, 13, 17, 35, 43, and 49.

I believe you will also find unanimous consent to apply the result of the division on the amendment to Motion No. 2 to Motions Nos. 10, 16, 21, 32, 34, and 44.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is consent given?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

• (1730)

Mrs. Venne: Mr. Speaker, we would certainly like to give our consent, but we want to tell you right away that we will have to give you the exact motion numbers and the negative or positive division accordingly. Either I put

it on the table as we did previously or I mention it directly, as you wish.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): I think the members will generally agree that we proceed as you did previously so that we speed things up. We take good note of that.

Is there unanimous consent to apply the result of the division?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The House divided on Motion No. 6, which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 511)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Arseneault
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bélair
Benjamin
Bevilacqua
Boudria
Butland
Clancy
Crawford
Dionne
Ferguson
Flis
Foster
Gauthier
Grey (Beaver River)
Harb
Heap
Jordan
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kristiansen
Lee
MacLaren
Maheu
Marchi
Martin (Lasalle—Émard)
Milliken
Nault
Nystrom
Pagtakhan
Parker
Phinney
Rideout
Speller
Tobin
Whittaker

Althouse
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Baker
Bellemare
Berger
Black
Breaugh
Caccia
Comuzzi
Dingwall
Duhamel
Finestone
Fontana
Gagliano
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hovdebo
Karpoff
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kindy
Langan (Mission—Coquitlam)
MacAulay
MacWilliam
Manley
Marleau
Mifflin
Mitchell
Nowlan
Ouellet
Parent
Peterson
Proud
Riis
Taylor
Wappel
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—74

NAYS

Members

Anderson
Atkinson
Beatty
Bernier
Bjornson
Blais
Bosley
Bouchard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Browes

Andre
Attewell
Belsher
Bertrand
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Bouchard (Roberval)
Brightwell
Cadieux

Casey
Chartrand
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Corbeil
Côté
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Domm
Duceppe
Epp
Feltham
Fontaine
Friesen
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Guilbault
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hicks
Hogue
Horner
Hughes
Jelinek
Joncas
Kempling
Landry
Lewis
MacDonald (Rosedale)
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
Mazankowski
McDermid
McLean
Mitges
Moore
Oberle
Paproski
Plourde
Pronovost
Reid
Ricard
Rocheleau
Saint-Julien
Shields
Sobeski
Stevenson
Tétreault
Thompson
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vézina
Vincent
Wilbee
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)

Chadwick
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clifford
Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Darling
Della Noce
Dobbie
Dorin
Duplessis
Fee
Ferland
Fretz
Gibeau
Greene
Halliday
Hawkes
Hockin
Holtmann
Horning
James
Johnson
Jourdenais
Koury
Langlois
Littlechild
MacDougall (Timiskaming—French River)
Marin
Masse
McCreath
McKnight
Merrithew
Monteith
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Plamondon
Porter
Redway
Reimer
Richardson
Roy-Arcelin
Schneider
Siddon
Sparrow
Tardif
Thacker
Thorkelson
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Van De Walle
Venne
Vien
Wenman

Winegard
Worthy—128

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anawak
Gaffney
Hudon
Layton
Walker

Bourgault
Hopkins
Karygiannis
McDougall (St. Paul's)
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)

The House divided on Motion No. 7, which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 512)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Arseneault
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)

Althouse
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Baker

Bélair
Benjamin
Bevilacqua
Bouchard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Breaugh
Caccia
Comuzzi
Dingwall
Duceppe
Ferguson
Flis
Foster
Gauthier
Grey (Beaver River)
Harb
Heap
Jordan
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kristiansen
Lee
MacLaren
Maheu
Marchi
Martin (Lasalle—Émard)
Milliken
Nault
Nystrom
Pagtakhan
Parker
Phinney
Proud
Riis
Speller
Tobin
Venne
Whittaker
Bellemare
Berger
Black
Boudria
Butland
Clancy
Crawford
Dionne
Duhamel
Finestone
Fontana
Gagliano
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hovdebo
Karpoff
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kindy
Langan (Mission—Coquitlam)
MacAulay
MacWilliam
Manley
Marleau
Mifflin
Mitchell
Nowlan
Ouellet
Parent
Peterson
Plamondon
Rideout
Rocheleau
Taylor
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Wappel
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—80

NAYS

Members

Anderson
Atkinson
Beatty
Bernier
Bjornson
Blais
Bosley
Brightwell
Cadieux
Chadwick
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clifford
Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Darling
Della Noce
Dobbie
Dorin
Epp
Feltham
Fontaine
Friesen
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Guilbault
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hicks
Hogue
Horner
Hughes
Jelinek
Joncas
Kempling
Landry
Lewis
MacDonald (Rosedale)
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
Mazankowski
McDermid
McLean
Mitges
Moore
Oberle
Paproski
Andre
Attewell
Belsher
Bertrand
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Bouchard (Roberval)
Browes
Casey
Chartrand
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Corbeil
Côté
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Domm
Duplessis
Fee
Ferland
Fretz
Gibeau
Greene
Halliday
Hawkes
Hockin
Holtmann
Horning
James
Johnson
Jourdenais
Koury
Langlois
Littlechild
MacDougall (Timiskaming—French River)
Marin
Masse
McCreath
McKnight
Merrithew
Monteith
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Plourde
Porter
Redway
Reimer
Richardson
Saint-Julien
Shields
Sobeski
Stevenson
Tétreault
Thompson
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Van De Walle
Vézina
Vincent
Wilbee
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Pronovost
Reid
Ricard
Roy-Arcelin
Schneider
Siddon
Sparrow
Tardif
Thacker
Thorkelson
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vien
Wenman
Winegard
Worthy—122

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anawak
Gaffney
Hudon
Layton
Walker
Bourgault
Hopkins
Karygiannis
McDougall (St. Paul's)
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)

The House divided on Motion No. 8, which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 513)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Arseneault
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bélair
Benjamin
Bevilacqua
Bouchard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Breaugh
Caccia
Comuzzi
Dingwall
Duceppe
Ferguson
Flis
Foster
Gauthier
Grey (Beaver River)
Harb
Heap
Jordan
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kristiansen
Lee
MacLaren
Maheu
Marchi
Martin (Lasalle—Émard)
Milliken
Nault
Nystrom
Pagtakhan
Parker
Phinney
Proud
Althouse
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Baker
Bellemare
Berger
Black
Boudria
Butland
Clancy
Crawford
Dionne
Duhamel
Finestone
Fontana
Gagliano
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hovdebo
Karpoff
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kindy
Langan (Mission—Coquitlam)
MacAulay
MacWilliam
Manley
Marleau
Mifflin
Mitchell
Nowlan
Ouellet
Parent
Peterson
Plamondon
Rideout

Riis
Speller
Tobin
Venne
Whittaker
Rocheleau
Taylor
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Wappel
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—80

NAYS

Members

Anderson
Atkinson
Beatty
Bernier
Bjornson
Blais
Bosley
Brightwell
Cadieux
Chadwick
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clifford
Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Darling
Della Noce
Dobbie
Dorin
Epp
Feltham
Fontaine
Friesen
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Guilbault
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hicks
Hogue
Horner
Hughes
Jelinek
Joncas
Kempling
Landry
Lewis
MacDonald (Rosedale)
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
Mazankowski
McDermid
McLean
Mitges
Moore
Oberle
Paproski
Porter
Redway
Reimer
Richardson
Saint-Julien
Shields
Sobeski
Stevenson
Tétreault
Thompson
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Van De Walle
Vézina
Vincent
Wilbee
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Andre
Attewell
Belsher
Bertrand
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Bouchard (Roberval)
Browes
Casey
Chartrand
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Corbeil
Côté
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Domm
Duplessis
Fee
Ferland
Fretz
Gibeau
Greene
Halliday
Hawkes
Hockin
Holtmann
Horning
James
Johnson
Jourdenais
Koury
Langlois
Littlechild
MacDougall (Timiskaming—French River)
Marin
Masse
McCreath
McKnight
Merrithew
Monteith
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Plourde
Pronovost
Reid
Ricard
Roy-Arcelin
Schneider
Siddon
Sparrow
Tardif
Thacker
Thorkelson
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vien
Wenman
Winegard
Worthy—122

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anawak
Gaffney
Hudon
Layton
Walker
Bourgault
Hopkins
Karygiannis
McDougall (St. Paul's)
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)

The House divided on Motion No. 10, which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 514)

YEAS

Members

Althouse
Benjamin
Breaugh
Heap
Karpoff
Kristiansen
MacWilliam
Nystrom
Riis
Whittaker
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Black
Butland
Hovdebo
Kindy
Langan (Mission—Coquitlam)
Mitchell
Parker
Taylor
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—20

NAYS

Members

Allmand
Andre
Atkinson
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Beatty
Bellemare
Berger
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blais
Bosley
Bouchard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Brightwell
Caccia
Casey
Chartrand
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clifford
Comuzzi
Corbeil
Côté
Crawford
Darling
Della Noce
Dingwall
Dobbie
Dorin
Duhamel
Epp
Feltham
Ferland
Flis
Fontana
Fretz
Gagliano
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Greene
Guarnieri
Halliday
Harvard
Hawkes
Hockin
Holtmann
Anderson
Arseneault
Attewell
Baker
Bélair
Belsher
Bernier
Bevilacqua
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Bouchard (Roberval)
Boudria
Browes
Cadieux
Chadwick
Clancy
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dionne
Domm
Duceppe
Duplessis
Fee
Ferguson
Finestone
Fontaine
Foster
Friesen
Gibeau
Gray (Windsor West)
Grey (Beaver River)
Guilbault
Harb
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hicks
Hogue
Horner

Horning
James
Johnson
Jordan
Kempling
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Koury
Langlois
Lewis
MacAulay
MacDougall (Timiskaming—French River)
Maheu
Manley
Marin
Martin (Lasalle—Émard)
Masse
McCreath
McKnight
Merrithew
Milliken
Monteith
Nault
Oberle
Ouellet
Paproski
Peterson
Plamondon
Porter
Proud
Reid
Ricard
Rideout
Roy-Arcelin
Schneider
Siddon
Sparrow
Stevenson
Tétreault
Thompson
Tobin
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Van De Walle
Venne
Vien
Wappel
Wilbee
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Hughes
Jelinek
Joncas
Jourdenais
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Landry
Lee
Littlechild
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacLaren
Malone
Marchi
Marleau
Martin (Lincoln)
Mazankowski
McDermid
McLean
Mifflin
Mitges
Moore
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Pagtakhan
Parent
Phinney
Plourde
Pronovost
Redway
Reimer
Richardson
Rocheleau
Saint-Julien
Shields
Sobeski
Speller
Tardif
Thacker
Thorkelson
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vézina
Vincent
Wenman
Winegard
Worthy—180

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anawak
Gaffney
Hudon
Layton
Walker
Bourgault
Hopkins
Karygiannis
McDougall (St. Paul's)
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)

The House divided on Motion No. 11, which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 515)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Arseneault
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bélair
Benjamin
Bevilacqua
Boudria
Butland
Clancy
Crawford
Dionne
Ferguson
Althouse
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Baker
Bellemare
Berger
Black
Breaugh
Caccia
Comuzzi
Dingwall
Duhamel
Finestone
Flis
Foster
Gauthier
Grey (Beaver River)
Harb
Heap
Jordan
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kristiansen
Lee
MacLaren
Maheu
Marchi
Martin (Lasalle—Émard)
Milliken
Nault
Nystrom
Pagtakhan
Parker
Phinney
Rideout
Speller
Tobin
Whittaker
Fontana
Gagliano
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hovdebo
Karpoff
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kindy
Langan (Mission—Coquitlam)
MacAulay
MacWilliam
Manley
Marleau
Mifflin
Mitchell
Nowlan
Ouellet
Parent
Peterson
Proud
Riis
Taylor
Wappel
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—74

NAYS

Members

Anderson
Atkinson
Beatty
Bernier
Bjornson
Blais
Bosley
Bouchard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Browes
Casey
Chartrand
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Corbeil
Côté
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Domm
Duceppe
Epp
Feltham
Fontaine
Friesen
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Guilbault
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hicks
Hogue
Horner
Hughes
Jelinek
Joncas
Kempling
Landry
Lewis
MacDonald (Rosedale)
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
Mazankowski
McDermid
McLean
Mitges
Moore
Oberle
Paproski
Plourde
Pronovost
Reid
Andre
Attewell
Belsher
Bertrand
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Bouchard (Roberval)
Brightwell
Cadieux
Chadwick
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clifford
Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Darling
Della Noce
Dobbie
Dorin
Duplessis
Fee
Ferland
Fretz
Gibeau
Greene
Halliday
Hawkes
Hockin
Holtmann
Horning
James
Johnson
Jourdenais
Koury
Langlois
Littlechild
MacDougall (Timiskaming—French River)
Marin
Masse
McCreath
McKnight
Merrithew
Monteith
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Plamondon
Porter
Redway
Reimer

Ricard
Rocheleau
Saint-Julien
Shields
Sobeski
Stevenson
Tétreault
Thompson
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vézina
Vincent
Wilbee
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Richardson
Roy-Arcelin
Schneider
Siddon
Sparrow
Tardif
Thacker
Thorkelson
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Van De Walle
Venne
Vien
Wenman

Winegard
Worthy—128

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anawak
Gaffney
Hudon
Layton
Walker
Bourgault
Hopkins
Karygiannis
McDougall (St. Paul's)
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)

• (1735)

The House divided on Motion No. 12, which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 516)

YEAS

Members

Althouse
Benjamin
Bouchard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Butland
Heap
Karpoff
Kristiansen
MacWilliam
Nystrom
Plamondon
Rocheleau
Venne
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—25
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Black
Breaugh
Duceppe
Hovdebo
Kindy
Langan (Mission—Coquitlam)
Mitchell
Parker
Riis
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Whittaker

NAYS

Members

Allmand
Andre
Atkinson
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Beatty
Bellemare
Berger
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blais
Bosley
Boudria
Browes
Cadieux
Chadwick
Clancy
Anderson
Arseneault
Attewell
Baker
Bélair
Belsher
Bernier
Bevilacqua
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Bouchard (Roberval)
Brightwell
Caccia
Casey
Chartrand
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dionne
Domm
Duhamel
Epp
Feltham
Ferland
Flis
Fontana
Fretz
Gagliano
Gibeau
Gray (Windsor West)
Grey (Beaver River)
Guilbault
Harb
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hicks
Hogue
Horner
Hughes
Jelinek
Joncas
Jourdenais
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Landry
Lee
Littlechild
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacLaren
Malone
Marleau
Martin (Lincoln)
Mazankowski
McLean
Mifflin
Mitges
Moore
Nicholson
Oberle
Ouellet
Peterson
Plourde
Pronovost
Redway
Reimer
Richardson
Roy-Arcelin
Schneider
Siddon
Sparrow
Stevenson
Tétreault
Thompson
Tobin
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vien
Wappel
Wilbee
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Clifford
Comuzzi
Corbeil
Côté
Crawford
Darling
Della Noce
Dingwall
Dobbie
Dorin
Duplessis
Fee
Ferguson
Finestone
Fontaine
Foster
Friesen
Gauthier
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Greene
Guarnieri
Halliday
Harvard
Hawkes
Hockin
Holtmann
Horning
James
Johnson
Jordan
Kempling
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Koury
Langlois
Lewis
MacAulay
MacDougall (Timiskaming—French River)
Maheu
Manley
Martin (Lasalle—Émard)
Masse
McCreath
Merrithew
Milliken
Monteith
Nault
Nowlan
O'Kurley
Pagtakhan
Phinney
Porter
Proud
Reid
Ricard
Rideout
Saint-Julien
Shields
Sobeski
Speller
Tardif
Thacker
Thorkelson
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Van De Walle
Vézina
Vincent
Wenman

Winegard
Worthy—170

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anawak
Gaffney
Hudon
Layton
Walker
Bourgault
Hopkins
Karygiannis
McDougall (St. Paul's)
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)

• (1740)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): I declare the motion negatived. Therefore I declare Motion No. 14 negatived.

The House divided on Motion No. 13, which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 517)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Arseneault
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bélair
Benjamin
Bevilacqua
Bouchard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Breaugh
Caccia
Comuzzi
Dingwall
Duceppe
Ferguson
Flis
Foster
Gauthier
Grey (Beaver River)
Harb
Heap
Jordan
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kristiansen
Lee
MacLaren
Maheu
Marchi
Martin (Lasalle—Émard)
Milliken
Nault
Nystrom
Pagtakhan
Parker
Phinney
Proud
Riis
Speller
Tobin
Venne
Whittaker
Althouse
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Baker
Bellemare
Berger
Black
Boudria
Butland
Clancy
Crawford
Dionne
Duhamel
Finestone
Fontana
Gagliano
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hovdebo
Karpoff
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kindy
Langan (Mission—Coquitlam)
MacAulay
MacWilliam
Manley
Marleau
Mifflin
Mitchell
Nowlan
Ouellet
Parent
Peterson
Plamondon
Rideout
Rocheleau
Taylor
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Wappel
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—80

NAYS

Members

Anderson
Atkinson
Beatty
Bernier
Bjornson
Blais
Bosley
Brightwell
Cadieux
Chadwick
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clifford
Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Darling
Della Noce
Dobbie
Dorin
Epp
Feltham
Fontaine
Friesen
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Guilbault
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hicks
Hogue
Horner
Hughes
Jelinek
Joncas
Kempling
Landry
Lewis
MacDonald (Rosedale)
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
Mazankowski
McDermid
McLean
Mitges
Moore
Oberle
Paproski
Porter
Redway
Reimer
Richardson
Saint-Julien
Shields
Sobeski
Stevenson
Tétreault
Thompson
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Van De Walle
Vézina
Vincent
Wilbee
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Andre
Attewell
Belsher
Bertrand
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Bouchard (Roberval)
Browes
Casey
Chartrand
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Corbeil
Côté
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Domm
Duplessis
Fee
Ferland
Fretz
Gibeau
Greene
Halliday
Hawkes
Hockin
Holtmann
Horning
James
Johnson
Jourdenais
Koury
Langlois
Littlechild
MacDougall (Timiskaming—French River)
Marin
Masse
McCreath
McKnight
Merrithew
Monteith
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Plourde
Pronovost
Reid
Ricard
Roy-Arcelin
Schneider
Siddon
Sparrow
Tardif
Thacker
Thorkelson
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vien
Wenman
Winegard
Worthy—122

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anawak
Gaffney
Hudon
Layton
Walker
Bourgault
Hopkins
Karygiannis
McDougall (St. Paul's)
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)

The House divided on Motion No. 16, which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 518)

YEAS

Members

Althouse
Benjamin
Bouchard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Butland
Heap
Karpoff
Kristiansen
MacWilliam
Nystrom
Plamondon
Rocheleau
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Whittaker
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Black
Breaugh
Duceppe
Hovdebo
Kindy
Langan (Mission—Coquitlam)
Mitchell
Parker
Riis
Taylor
Venne
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—26

NAYS

Members

Allmand
Andre
Atkinson
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Beatty
Bellemare
Berger
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blais
Bosley
Boudria
Browes
Cadieux
Chadwick
Clancy
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dionne
Domm
Duhamel
Epp
Feltham
Ferland
Flis
Fontana
Fretz
Gagliano
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Greene
Guarnieri
Halliday
Harvard
Hawkes
Hockin
Holtmann
Horning
James
Johnson
Jordan
Kempling
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Koury
Langlois
Lewis
MacAulay
MacDougall (Timiskaming—French River)
Maheu
Manley
Marin
Martin (Lasalle—Émard)
Masse
McCreath
McKnight
Merrithew
Milliken
Monteith
Nault
Oberle
Ouellet
Paproski
Peterson
Plourde
Pronovost
Redway
Reimer
Richardson
Roy-Arcelin
Schneider
Siddon
Sparrow
Stevenson
Tétreault
Thompson
Tobin
Valcourt
Anderson
Arseneault
Attewell
Baker
Bélair
Belsher
Bernier
Bevilacqua
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Bouchard (Roberval)
Brightwell
Caccia
Casey
Chartrand
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clifford
Comuzzi
Corbeil
Côté
Crawford
Darling
Della Noce
Dingwall
Dobbie
Dorin
Duplessis
Fee
Ferguson
Finestone
Fontaine
Foster
Friesen
Gibeau
Gray (Windsor West)
Grey (Beaver River)
Guilbault
Harb
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hicks
Hogue
Horner
Hughes
Jelinek
Joncas
Jourdenais
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Landry
Lee
Littlechild
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacLaren
Malone
Marchi
Marleau
Martin (Lincoln)
Mazankowski
McDermid
McLean
Mifflin
Mitges
Moore
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Pagtakhan
Parent
Phinney
Porter
Proud
Reid
Ricard
Rideout
Saint-Julien
Shields
Sobeski
Speller
Tardif
Thacker
Thorkelson
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Van De Walle
Vankoughnet
Vien
Wappel
Wilbee
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Vézina
Vincent
Wenman
Winegard
Worthy—174

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anawak
Gaffney
Hudon
Layton
Walker
Bourgault
Hopkins
Karygiannis
McDougall (St. Paul's)
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)

The House divided on Motion No. 17, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 519*)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Arseneault
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bélair
Benjamin
Bevilacqua
Bouchard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Breaugh
Caccia
Comuzzi
Dingwall
Duceppe
Ferguson
Flis
Foster
Gauthier
Grey (Beaver River)
Harb
Heap
Jordan
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kristiansen
Lee
MacLaren
Maheu
Marchi
Martin (Lasalle—Émard)
Milliken
Nault
Nystrom
Pagtakhan
Parker
Phinney
Proud
Riis
Speller
Tobin
Venne
Whittaker
Althouse
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Baker
Bellemare
Berger
Black
Boudria
Butland
Clancy
Crawford
Dionne
Duhamel
Finestone
Fontana
Gagliano
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hovdebo
Karpoff
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kindy
Langan (Mission—Coquitlam)
MacAulay
MacWilliam
Manley
Marleau
Mifflin
Mitchell
Nowlan
Ouellet
Parent
Peterson
Plamondon
Rideout
Rocheleau
Taylor
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Wappel
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—80

NAYS

Members

Anderson
Atkinson
Beatty
Bernier
Bjornson
Blais
Bosley
Brightwell
Cadieux
Chadwick
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clifford
Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Darling
Della Noce
Dobbie
Dorin
Epp
Feltham
Fontaine
Friesen
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Guilbault
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hicks
Hogue
Horner
Hughes
Jelinek
Joncas
Kempling
Landry
Lewis
MacDonald (Rosedale)
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
Mazankowski
McDermid
McLean
Mitges
Moore
Oberle
Paproski
Porter
Redway
Reimer
Richardson
Saint-Julien
Shields
Sobeski
Stevenson
Têtreault
Thompson
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Van De Walle
Vézina
Vincent
Wilbee
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Andre
Attewell
Belsher
Bertrand
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Bouchard (Roberval)
Browes
Casey
Chartrand
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Corbeil
Côté
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Domm
Duplessis
Fee
Ferland
Fretz
Gibeau
Greene
Halliday
Hawkes
Hockin
Holtmann
Horning
James
Johnson
Jourdenais
Koury
Langlois
Littlechild
MacDougall (Timiskaming—French River)
Marin
Masse
McCreath
McKnight
Merrithew
Monteith
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Plourde
Pronovost
Reid
Ricard
Roy-Arcelin
Schneider
Siddon
Sparrow
Tardif
Thacker
Thorkelson
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vien
Wenman
Winegard
Worthy—122

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anawak
Gaffney
Hudon
Layton
Walker
Bourgault
Hopkins
Karygiannis
McDougall (St. Paul's)
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)

The House divided on Motion No. 18, which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 520)

YEAS

Members

Althouse
Benjamin
Bouchard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Butland
Heap
Karpoff
Kristiansen
MacWilliam
Nystrom
Plamondon
Rocheleau
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Whittaker
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Black
Breaugh
Duceppe
Hovdebo
Kindy
Langan (Mission—Coquitlam)
Mitchell
Parker
Riis
Taylor
Venne
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—26

NAYS

Members

Allmand
Andre
Atkinson
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Beatty
Bellemare
Berger
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blais
Bosley
Boudria
Browes
Cadieux
Chadwick
Clancy
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dionne
Domm
Duhamel
Epp
Feltham
Ferland
Flis
Fontana
Fretz
Gagliano
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Greene
Guarnieri
Halliday
Harvard
Hawkes
Hockin
Holtmann
Horning
James
Johnson
Jordan
Kempling
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Koury
Langlois
Anderson
Arseneault
Attewell
Baker
Bélair
Belsher
Bernier
Bevilacqua
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Bouchard (Roberval)
Brightwell
Caccia
Casey
Chartrand
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clifford
Comuzzi
Corbeil
Côté
Crawford
Darling
Della Noce
Dingwall
Dobbie
Dorin
Duplessis
Fee
Ferguson
Finestone
Fontaine
Foster
Friesen
Gibeau
Gray (Windsor West)
Grey (Beaver River)
Guilbault
Harb
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hicks
Hogue
Horner
Hughes
Jelinek
Joncas
Jourdenais
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Landry
Lee

Lewis
MacAulay
MacDougall (Timiskaming—French River)
Maheu
Manley
Marin
Martin (Lasalle—Émard)
Masse
McCreath
McKnight
Merrithew
Milliken
Monteith
Nault
Oberle
Ouellet
Paproski
Peterson
Plourde
Pronovost
Redway
Reimer
Richardson
Roy-Arcelin
Schneider
Siddon
Sparrow
Stevenson
Tétreault
Thompson
Tobin
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vien
Wappel
Wilbee
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Littlechild
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacLaren
Malone
Marchi
Marleau
Martin (Lincoln)
Mazankowski
McDermid
McLean
Mifflin
Mitges
Moore
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Pagtakhan
Parent
Phinney
Porter
Proud
Reid
Ricard
Rideout
Saint-Julien
Shields
Sobeski
Speller
Tardif
Thacker
Thorkelson
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Van De Walle
Vézina
Vincent
Wenman
Winegard
Worthy—174

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anawak
Gaffney
Hudon
Layton
Walker
Bourgault
Hopkins
Karygiannis
McDougall (St. Paul's)
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)

The House divided on Motion No. 21, which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 521)

YEAS

Members

Althouse
Benjamin
Bouchard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Butland
Heap
Karpoff
Kristiansen
MacWilliam
Nystrom
Plamondon
Rocheleau
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Whittaker
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Black
Breaugh
Duceppe
Hovdebo
Kindy
Langan (Mission—Coquitlam)
Mitchell
Parker
Riis
Taylor
Venne
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—26

NAYS

Members

Allmand
Andre
Atkinson
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Beatty
Bellemare
Berger
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blais
Bosley
Boudria
Browes
Cadieux
Chadwick
Clancy
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dionne
Domm
Duhamel
Epp
Feltham
Ferland
Flis
Fontana
Fretz
Gagliano
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Greene
Guarnieri
Halliday
Harvard
Hawkes
Hockin
Holtmann
Horning
James
Johnson
Jordan
Kempling
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Koury
Langlois
Lewis
MacAulay
MacDougall (Timiskaming—French River)
Maheu
Manley
Marin
Martin (Lasalle—Émard)
Masse
McCreath
McKnight
Merrithew
Milliken
Monteith
Nault
Oberle
Ouellet
Paproski
Peterson
Plourde
Pronovost
Redway
Reimer
Richardson
Roy-Arcelin
Schneider
Siddon
Sparrow
Stevenson
Tétreault
Thompson
Anderson
Arseneault
Attewell
Baker
Bélair
Belsher
Bernier
Bevilacqua
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Bouchard (Roberval)
Brightwell
Caccia
Casey
Chartrand
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clifford
Comuzzi
Corbeil
Côté
Crawford
Darling
Della Noce
Dingwall
Dobbie
Dorin
Duplessis
Fee
Ferguson
Finestone
Fontaine
Foster
Friesen
Gibeau
Gray (Windsor West)
Grey (Beaver River)
Guilbault
Harb
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hicks
Hogue
Horner
Hughes
Jelinek
Joncas
Jourdenais
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Landry
Lee
Littlechild
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacLaren
Malone
Marchi
Marleau
Martin (Lincoln)
Mazankowski
McDermid
McLean
Mifflin
Mitges
Moore
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Pagtakhan
Parent
Phinney
Porter
Proud
Reid
Ricard
Rideout
Saint-Julien
Shields
Sobeski
Speller
Tardif
Thacker
Thorkelson

Tobin
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vien
Wappel
Wilbee
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Van De Walle
Vézina
Vincent
Wenman
Winegard
Worthy—174

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anawak
Gaffney
Hudon
Layton
Walker
Bourgault
Hopkins
Karygiannis
McDougall (St. Paul's)
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): The next question is on Motion No. 22.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The House divided on Motion No. 22, which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 522)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bélair
Berger
Boudria
Clancy
Crawford
Dionne
Ferguson
Flis
Foster
Gauthier
Guarnieri
Harvard
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
MacAulay
Maheu
Marchi
Martin (Lasalle—Émard)
Milliken
Ouellet
Arseneault
Baker
Bellemare
Bevilacqua
Caccia
Comuzzi
Dingwall
Duhamel
Finestone
Fontana
Gagliano
Gray (Windsor West)
Harb
Jordan
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Lee
MacLaren
Manley
Marleau
Mifflin
Nault
Pagtakhan
Parent
Phinney
Rideout
Tobin
Peterson
Proud
Speller
Wappel—52

NAYS

Members

Althouse
Andre
Attewell
Beatty
Benjamin
Bertrand
Black
Blais
Bosley
Bouchard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Brightwell
Butland
Casey
Chartrand
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Corbeil
Côté
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Domm
Duceppe
Epp
Feltham
Fontaine
Friesen
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Grey (Beaver River)
Halliday
Hawkes
Hicks
Hogue
Horner
Hovdebo
James
Johnson
Jourdenais
Kempling
Koury
Landry
Langlois
Littlechild
MacDougall (Timiskaming—French River)
Malone
Masse
McCreath
Merrithew
Mitges
Moore
Nowlan
Oberle
Parker
Plourde
Pronovost
Reid
Ricard
Riis
Roy-Arcelin
Schneider
Siddon
Sparrow
Tardif
Tétreault
Thompson
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vézina
Vincent
Anderson
Atkinson
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Belsher
Bernier
Bjornson
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Bouchard (Roberval)
Breaugh
Browes
Cadieux
Chadwick
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clifford
Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Darling
Della Noce
Dobbie
Dorin
Duplessis
Fee
Ferland
Fretz
Gibeau
Greene
Guilbault
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Heap
Hockin
Holtmann
Horning
Hughes
Jelinek
Joncas
Karpoff
Kindy
Kristiansen
Langan (Mission—Coquitlam)
Lewis
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacWilliam
Martin (Lincoln)
Mazankowski
McLean
Mitchell
Monteith
Nicholson
Nystrom
O'Kurley
Plamondon
Porter
Redway
Reimer
Richardson
Rocheleau
Saint-Julien
Shields
Sobeski
Stevenson
Taylor
Thacker
Thorkelson
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Van De Walle
Venne
Vien
Wenman

Whittaker
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—146

Wilbee
Winegard
Worthy

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anawak
Gaffney
Hudon
Layton
Walker

Bourgault
Hopkins
Karygiannis
McDougall (St. Paul's)
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): I declare the motion negatived.

• (1745)

The House divided on Motion No. 23, which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 523)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Arseneault
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bellemare
Black
Breaugh
Caccia
Comuzzi
Dingwall
Duhamel
Finestone
Fontana
Gagliano
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Heap
Jordan
Keyes
Kindy
Langan (Mission—Coquitlam)
MacAulay
MacWilliam
Manley
Martin (Lasalle—Émard)
Milliken
Nault
Nystrom
Pagtakhan
Parker
Phinney
Proud
Riis
Speller
Tobin
Venne
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—71

Althouse
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bélair
Bevilacqua
Bouchard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Butland
Clancy
Crawford
Duceppe
Ferguson
Flis
Foster
Gauthier
Grey (Beaver River)
Harvard
Hovdebo
Karpoff
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kristiansen
Lee
MacLaren
Maheu
Marleau
Mifflin
Mitchell
Nowlan
Ouellet
Parent
Peterson
Plamondon
Rideout
Rocheleau
Taylor
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Whittaker

NAYS

Members

Anderson
Atkinson
Beatty
Bernier

Andre
Attewell
Belsher
Bertrand

Bjornson
Blais
Bosley
Brightwell
Cadieux
Chadwick
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clifford
Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Darling
Della Noce
Dobbie
Dorin
Epp
Feltham
Fontaine
Friesen
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Guilbault
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hicks
Hogue
Horner
Hughes
Jelinek
Joncas
Kempling
Landry
Lewis
MacDonald (Rosedale)
Malone
Mazankowski
McLean
Mitges
Moore
Oberle
Plourde
Pronovost
Reid
Ricard
Roy-Arcelin
Schneider
Siddon
Sparrow
Tardif
Thacker
Thorkelson
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vien
Wenman
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)

Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Bouchard (Roberval)
Browes
Casey
Chartrand
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Corbeil
Côté
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Domm
Duplessis
Fee
Ferland
Fretz
Gibeau
Greene
Halliday
Hawkes
Hockin
Holtmann
Horning
James
Johnson
Jourdenais
Koury
Langlois
Littlechild
MacDougall (Timiskaming—French River)
Martin (Lincoln)
McCreath
Merrithew
Monteith
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Porter
Redway
Reimer
Richardson
Saint-Julien
Shields
Sobeski
Stevenson
Tétreault
Thompson
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Van De Walle
Vézina
Vincent
Wilbee
Winegard
Worthy—117

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anawak
Gaffney
Hudon
Layton
Walker

Bourgault
Hopkins
Karygiannis
McDougall (St. Paul's)
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 32, which was negatived on the following division:

Government Orders

(Division No. 524)

YEAS

Members

Althouse
Benjamin
Bouchard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Butland
Heap
Karpoff
Kristiansen
MacWilliam
Nystrom
Plamondon
Rocheleau
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Whittaker
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Black
Breaugh
Duceppe
Hovdebo
Kindy
Langan (Mission—Coquitlam)
Mitchell
Parker
Riis
Taylor
Venne
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—26

NAYS

Members

Allmand
Andre
Atkinson
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Beatty
Bellemare
Berger
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blais
Bosley
Boudria
Browes
Cadieux
Chadwick
Clancy
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dionne
Domm
Duhamel
Epp
Feltham
Ferland
Flis
Fontana
Fretz
Gagliano
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Greene
Guarnieri
Halliday
Harvard
Hawkes
Hockin
Holtmann
Horning
James
Johnson
Jordan
Kempling
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Koury
Langlois
Lewis
MacAulay
MacDougall (Timiskaming—French River)
Maheu
Manley
Marin
Martin (Lasalle—Émard)
Masse
McCreath
McKnight
Merrithew
Milliken
Monteith
Anderson
Arseneault
Attewell
Baker
Bélair
Belsher
Bernier
Bevilacqua
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Bouchard (Roberval)
Brightwell
Caccia
Casey
Chartrand
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clifford
Comuzzi
Corbeil
Côté
Crawford
Darling
Della Noce
Dingwall
Dobbie
Dorin
Duplessis
Fee
Ferguson
Finestone
Fontaine
Foster
Friesen
Gibeau
Gray (Windsor West)
Grey (Beaver River)
Guilbault
Harb
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hicks
Hogue
Horner
Hughes
Jelinek
Joncas
Jourdenais
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Landry
Lee
Littlechild
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacLaren
Malone
Marchi
Marleau
Martin (Lincoln)
Mazankowski
McDermid
McLean
Mifflin
Mitges
Moore
Nault
Oberle
Ouellet
Paproski
Peterson
Plourde
Pronovost
Redway
Reimer
Richardson
Roy-Arcelin
Schneider
Siddon
Sparrow
Stevenson
Tétreault
Thompson
Tobin
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vien
Wappel
Wilbee
Winegard
Worthy—174
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Pagtakhan
Parent
Phinney
Porter
Proud
Reid
Ricard
Rideout
Saint-Julien
Shields
Sobeski
Speller
Tardif
Thacker
Thorkelson
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Van De Walle
Vézina
Vincent
Wenman
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anawak
Gaffney
Hudon
Layton
Walker
Bourgault
Hopkins
Karygiannis
McDougall (St. Paul's)
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)

The House divided on Motion No. 34, which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 525)

YEAS

Members

Althouse
Benjamin
Breaugh
Heap
Karpoff
Kristiansen
MacWilliam
Nystrom
Riis
Whittaker
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Black
Butland
Hovdebo
Kindy
Langan (Mission—Coquitlam)
Mitchell
Parker
Taylor
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—20

NAYS

Members

Allmand
Andre
Atkinson
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Beatty
Bellemare
Berger
Bertrand
Anderson
Arseneault
Attewell
Baker
Bélair
Belsher
Bernier
Bevilacqua

Bjornson
Blais
Bosley
Bouchard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Brightwell
Caccia
Casey
Chartrand
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clifford
Comuzzi
Corbeil
Côté
Crawford
Darling
Della Noce
Dingwall
Dobbie
Dorin
Duhamel
Epp
Feltham
Ferland
Flis
Fontana
Fretz
Gagliano
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Greene
Guarnieri
Halliday
Harvard
Hawkes
Hockin
Holtmann
Horning
James
Johnson
Jordan
Kempling
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Koury
Langlois
Lewis
MacAulay
MacDougall (Timiskaming—French River)
Maheu
Manley
Marin
Martin (Lasalle—Émard)
Masse
McCreath
McKnight
Merrithew
Milliken
Monteith
Nault
Oberle
Ouellet
Paproski
Peterson
Plamondon
Porter
Proud
Reid
Ricard
Rideout
Roy-Arcelin
Schneider
Siddon
Sparrow
Stevenson
Tétreault
Thompson
Tobin
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Van De Walle
Venne
Vien
Wappel
Wilbee
Winegard
Worthy—180

Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Bouchard (Roberval)
Boudria
Browes
Cadieux
Chadwick
Clancy
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dionne
Domm
Duceppe
Duplessis
Fee
Ferguson
Finestone
Fontaine
Foster
Friesen
Gibeau
Gray (Windsor West)
Grey (Beaver River)
Guilbault
Harb
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hicks
Hogue
Horner
Hughes
Jelinek
Joncas
Jourdenais
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Landry
Lee
Littlechild
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacLaren
Malone
Marchi
Marleau
Martin (Lincoln)
Mazankowski
McDermid
McLean
Mifflin
Mitges
Moore
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Pagtakhan
Parent
Phinney
Plourde
Pronovost
Redway
Reimer
Richardson
Rocheleau
Saint-Julien
Shields
Sobeski
Speller
Tardif
Thacker
Thorkelson
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vézina
Vincent
Wenman
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anawak
Gaffney
Hudon
Layton
Walker

Bourgault
Hopkins
Karygiannis
McDougall (St. Paul's)
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)

The House divided on Motion No. 35, which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 526)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Arseneault
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bélair
Benjamin
Bevilacqua
Boudria
Butland
Clancy
Crawford
Dionne
Ferguson
Flis
Foster
Gauthier
Grey (Beaver River)
Harb
Heap
Jordan
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kristiansen
Lee
MacLaren
Maheu
Marchi
Martin (Lasalle—Émard)
Milliken
Nault
Nystrom
Pagtakhan
Parker
Phinney
Rideout
Speller
Tobin
Whittaker

Althouse
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Baker
Bellemare
Berger
Black
Breaugh
Caccia
Comuzzi
Dingwall
Duhamel
Finestone
Fontana
Gagliano
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hovdebo
Karpoff
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kindy
Langan (Mission—Coquitlam)
MacAulay
MacWilliam
Manley
Marleau
Mifflin
Mitchell
Nowlan
Ouellet
Parent
Peterson
Proud
Riis
Taylor
Wappel
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—74

NAYS

Members

Anderson
Atkinson
Beatty
Bernier
Bjornson
Blais
Bosley
Bouchard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Browes
Casey
Chartrand
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Corbeil
Côté
Danis

Andre
Attewell
Belsher
Bertrand
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Bouchard (Roberval)
Brightwell
Cadieux
Chadwick
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clifford
Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Darling

de Cotret
Desjardins
Domm
Duceppe
Epp
Feltham
Fontaine
Friesen
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Guilbault
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hicks
Hogue
Horner
Hughes
Jelinek
Joncas
Kempling
Landry
Lewis
MacDonald (Rosedale)
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
Mazankowski
McDermid
McLean
Mitges
Moore
Oberle
Paproski
Plourde
Pronovost
Reid
Ricard
Rocheleau
Saint-Julien
Shields
Sobeski
Stevenson
Tétreault
Thompson
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vézina
Vincent
Wilbee
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek Assiniboia)
Worthy—128

Della Noce
Dobbie
Dorin
Duplessis
Fee
Ferland
Fretz
Gibeau
Greene
Halliday
Hawkes
Hockin
Holtmann
Horning
James
Johnson
Jourdenais
Koury
Langlois
Littlechild
MacDougall (Timiskaming—French River)
Marin
Masse
McCreath
McKnight
Merrithew
Monteith
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Plamondon
Porter
Redway
Reimer
Richardson
Roy-Arcelin
Schneider
Siddon
Sparrow
Tardif
Thacker
Thorkelson
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Van De Walle
Venne
Vien
Wenman

Winegard

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anawak
Gaffney
Hudon
Layton
Walker

Bourgault
Hopkins
Karygiannis
McDougall (St. Paul's)
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)

The House divided on Motion No. 43, which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 527)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Arseneault
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bélair
Benjamin
Bevilacqua
Boudria
Butland
Clancy
Crawford
Dionne
Ferguson
Flis
Foster
Gauthier
Grey (Beaver River)
Harb
Heap

Althouse
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Baker
Bellemare
Berger
Black
Breaugh
Caccia
Comuzzi
Dingwall
Duhamel
Finestone
Fontana
Gagliano
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hovdebo

Jordan
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kristiansen
Lee
MacLaren
Maheu
Marchi
Martin (Lasalle—Émard)
Milliken
Nault
Nystrom
Pagtakhan
Parker
Phinney
Rideout
Speller
Tobin
Whittaker

Karpoff
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kindy
Langan (Mission—Coquitlam)
MacAulay
MacWilliam
Manley
Marleau
Mifflin
Mitchell
Nowlan
Ouellet
Parent
Peterson
Proud
Riis
Taylor
Wappel
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—74

NAYS

Members

Anderson
Atkinson
Beatty
Bernier
Bjornson
Blais
Bosley
Bouchard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Browes
Casey
Chartrand
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Corbeil
Côté
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Domm
Duceppe
Epp
Feltham
Fontaine
Friesen
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Guilbault
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hicks
Hogue
Horner
Hughes
Jelinek
Joncas
Kempling
Landry
Lewis
MacDonald (Rosedale)
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
Mazankowski
McDermid
McLean
Mitges
Moore
Oberle
Paproski
Plourde
Pronovost

Andre
Attewell
Belsher
Bertrand
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Bouchard (Roberval)
Brightwell
Cadieux
Chadwick
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clifford
Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Darling
Della Noce
Dobbie
Dorin
Duplessis
Fee
Ferland
Fretz
Gibeau
Greene
Halliday
Hawkes
Hockin
Holtmann
Horning
James
Johnson
Jourdenais
Koury
Langlois
Littlechild
MacDougall (Timiskaming—French River)
Marin
Masse
McCreath
McKnight
Merrithew
Monteith
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Plamondon
Porter
Redway

Reid
Ricard
Rocheleau
Saint-Julien
Shields
Sobeski
Stevenson
Tétreault
Thompson
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vézina
Vincent
Wilbee
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek-Assiniboia)
Worthy—128

Reimer
Richardson
Roy-Arcelin
Schneider
Siddon
Sparrow
Tardif
Thacker
Thorkelson
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Van De Walle
Venne
Vien
Wenman

Winegard

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anawak
Gaffney
Hudon
Layton
Walker

Bourgault
Hopkins
Karygiannis
McDougall (St. Paul's)
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)

The House divided on Motion No. 44, which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 528)

YEAS

Members

Althouse
Benjamin
Bouchard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Butland
Heap
Karpoff
Kristiansen
MacWilliam
Nystrom
Plamondon
Rocheleau
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Whittaker

Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Black
Breaugh
Duceppe
Hovdebo
Kindy
Langan (Mission—Coquitlam)
Mitchell
Parker
Riis
Taylor
Venne
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—26

NAYS

Members

Allmand
Andre
Atkinson
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Beatty
Bellemare
Berger
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blais
Bosley
Boudria
Browes
Cadieux
Chadwick
Clancy
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Danis

Anderson
Arseneault
Attewell
Baker
Bélair
Belsher
Bernier
Bevilacqua
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Bouchard (Roberval)
Brightwell
Caccia
Casey
Chartrand
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clifford
Comuzzi
Corbeil
Côté
Crawford
Darling

de Cotret
Desjardins
Dionne
Domm
Duhamel
Epp
Feltham
Ferland
Flis
Fontana
Fretz
Gagliano
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Greene
Guarnieri
Halliday
Harvard
Hawkes
Hockin
Holtmann
Horning
James
Johnson
Jordan
Kempling
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Koury
Langlois
Lewis
MacAulay
MacDougall (Timiskaming—French River)
Maheu
Manley
Marin
Martin (Lasalle—Émard)
Masse
McCreath
McKnight
Merrithew
Milliken
Monteith
Nault
Oberle
Ouellet
Paproski
Peterson
Plourde
Pronovost
Redway
Reimer
Richardson
Roy-Arcelin
Schneider
Siddon
Sparrow
Stevenson
Tétreault
Thompson
Tobin
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vien
Wappel
Wilbee
Winegard
Worthy—174

Della Noce
Dingwall
Dobbie
Dorin
Duplessis
Fee
Ferguson
Finestone
Fontaine
Foster
Friesen
Gibeau
Gray (Windsor West)
Grey (Beaver River)
Guilbault
Harb
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hicks
Hogue
Horner
Hughes
Jelinek
Joncas
Jourdenais
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Landry
Lee
Littlechild
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacLaren
Malone
Marchi
Marleau
Martin (Lincoln)
Mazankowski
McDermid
McLean
Mifflin
Mitges
Moore
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Pagtakhan
Parent
Phinney
Porter
Proud
Reid
Ricard
Rideout
Saint-Julien
Shields
Sobeski
Speller
Tardif
Thacker
Thorkelson
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Van De Walle
Vézina
Vincent
Wenman
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anawak
Gaffney
Hudon
Layton
Walker

Bourgault
Hopkins
Karygiannis
McDougall (St. Paul's)
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)

The House divided on Motion No. 49, which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 529)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Arseneault
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bélair
Benjamin
Bevilacqua
Boudria
Butland
Clancy
Crawford
Dionne
Ferguson
Flis
Foster
Gauthier
Grey (Beaver River)
Harb
Heap
Jordan
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kristiansen
Lee
MacLaren
Maheu
Marchi
Martin (Lasalle—Émard)
Milliken
Nault
Nystrom
Pagtakhan
Parker
Phinney
Rideout
Speller
Tobin
Whittaker
Althouse
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Baker
Bellemare
Berger
Black
Breaugh
Caccia
Comuzzi
Dingwall
Duhamel
Finestone
Fontana
Gagliano
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hovdebo
Karpoff
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kindy
Langan (Mission—Coquitlam)
MacAulay
MacWilliam
Manley
Marleau
Mifflin
Mitchell
Nowlan
Ouellet
Parent
Peterson
Proud
Riis
Taylor
Wappel
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—74

NAYS

Members

Anderson
Atkinson
Beatty
Bernier
Bjornson
Blais
Bosley
Bouchard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Browes
Casey
Chartrand
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Corbeil
Côté
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Domm
Duceppe
Epp
Feltham
Fontaine
Friesen
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Guilbault
Andre
Attewell
Belsher
Bertrand
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Bouchard (Roberval)
Brightwell
Cadieux
Chadwick
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clifford
Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Darling
Della Noce
Dobbie
Dorin
Duplessis
Fee
Ferland
Fretz
Gibeau
Greene
Halliday
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hicks
Hogue
Horner
Hughes
Jelinek
Joncas
Kempling
Landry
Lewis
MacDonald (Rosedale)
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
Mazankowski
McDermid
McLean
Mitges
Moore
Oberle
Paproski
Plourde
Pronovost
Reid
Ricard
Rocheleau
Saint-Julien
Shields
Sobeski
Stevenson
Tétreault
Thompson
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vézina
Vincent
Wilbee
Winegard
Worthy—128
Hawkes
Hockin
Holtmann
Horning
James
Johnson
Jourdenais
Koury
Langlois
Littlechild
MacDougall (Timiskaming—French River)
Marin
Masse
McCreath
McKnight
Merrithew
Monteith
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Plamondon
Porter
Redway
Reimer
Richardson
Roy-Arcelin
Schneider
Siddon
Sparrow
Tardif
Thacker
Thorkelson
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Van De Walle
Venne
Vien
Wenman
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anawak
Gaffney
Hudon
Layton
Walker
Bourgault
Hopkins
Karygiannis
McDougall (St. Paul's)
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)

• (1755)

[*English*]

Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of Communications) moved that the bill be concurred in.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Mr. Gagliano: Mr. Speaker, I believe that at this time we might have unanimous consent to apply the division for the vote on the amendment to Motion No. 2 in reverse to the motion for concurrence.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Venne: Mr. Speaker, since we are still at the report stage and we must vote on the motion for concurrence and thus on the whole report, members of

the Bloc Quebecois wish to vote against this motion because we oppose this bill.

Mr. Kindy: Mr. Speaker, I too wish to vote against this bill.

[*English*]

Miss Grey: Mr. Speaker, I would like it on the record that I am voting yea at concurrence.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 530)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Andre
Atkinson
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Beatty
Bellemare
Berger
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blais
Bosley
Boudria
Browes
Cadieux
Chadwick
Clancy
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dionne
Domm
Duhamel
Epp
Feltham
Ferland
Flis
Fontana
Fretz
Gagliano
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Greene
Guarnieri
Halliday
Harvard
Hawkes
Hockin
Holtmann
Horning
James
Johnson
Jordan
Kempling
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Koury
Langlois
Lewis
MacAulay
MacDougall (Timiskaming—French River)
Maheu
Manley
Marin
Martin (Lasalle—Émard)
Anderson
Arseneault
Attewell
Baker
Bélair
Belsher
Bernier
Bevilacqua
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Bouchard (Roberval)
Brightwell
Caccia
Casey
Chartrand
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clifford
Comuzzi
Corbeil
Côté
Crawford
Darling
Della Noce
Dingwall
Dobbie
Dorin
Duplessis
Fee
Ferguson
Finestone
Fontaine
Foster
Friesen
Gibeau
Gray (Windsor West)
Grey (Beaver River)
Guilbault
Harb
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hicks
Hogue
Horner
Hughes
Jelinek
Joncas
Jourdenais
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Landry
Lee
Littlechild
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacLaren
Malone
Marchi
Marleau
Martin (Lincoln)
Masse
McCreath
McKnight
Merrithew
Milliken
Monteith
Nault
Oberle
Ouellet
Paproski
Peterson
Plourde
Pronovost
Redway
Reimer
Richardson
Roy-Arcelin
Schneider
Siddon
Sparrow
Stevenson
Tétreault
Thompson
Tobin
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vien
Wappel
Wilbee
Winegard
Worthy—174
Mazankowski
McDermid
McLean
Mifflin
Mitges
Moore
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Pagtakhan
Parent
Phinney
Porter
Proud
Reid
Ricard
Rideout
Saint-Julien
Shields
Sobeski
Speller
Tardif
Thacker
Thorkelson
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Van De Walle
Vézina
Vincent
Wenman
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)

NAYS

Members

Althouse
Benjamin
Bouchard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Butland
Heap
Karpoff
Kristiansen
MacWilliam
Nystrom
Plamondon
Rocheleau
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Whittaker
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Black
Breaugh
Duceppe
Hovdebo
Kindy
Langan (Mission—Coquitlam)
Mitchell
Parker
Riis
Taylor
Venne
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—26

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anawak
Gaffney
Hudon
Layton
Walker
Bourgault
Hopkins
Karygiannis
McDougall (St. Paul's)
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): I declare the motion carried.

When shall the bill be read the third time? At the next sitting of the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): I suggest to hon. members that because there are only three minutes before six o'clock we declare it six o'clock p.m. Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

AIDS

Mr. Rey Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, in answer to my question on April 20 the minister of health refused to initiate a national strategy to trace all victims of AIDS tainted blood until the Toronto Hospital for Sick Children had completed its investigation.

From the years 1980 to 1985 thousands and thousands of Canadians could have been infected with the HIV virus. The answer of the minister was not adequate for several reasons. The delay is inexcusable for those who are HIV positive but who do not have the symptoms. We know they may infect others.

The doctors may be slower to recognize the diagnosis in the presence of symptoms without knowing the actual positivity of the patients with respect to HIV.

Third, we know that preventive therapy could be available whereby infected Canadians without the symptoms could be treated early and thereby prevent the onset of the true AIDS disease.

I also submit that by tracing all the victims we will extinguish their anguish and that of their families who do not know their real status. We cannot afford to leave them in limbo. The piecemeal approach that the minister was suggesting allows each of the provinces to proceed on their own. It is unacceptable and reflects an absence of national leadership.

• (1800)

Moreover the minister did not reply at all to my other questions. Will he compensate the victims of HIV-tainted blood as soon as they are discovered? We know that Nova Scotia and now Quebec and Ontario have considered paying the victims additional amounts. Why is the federal government refusing to come forward with an additional compensation package, knowing the seriousness of the disease and the toll that this has imposed on families?

We know that people who went for health care between 1980 and 1985 were infected because of the failure of the national blood system. They ought not to be penalized financially for such a failure of the national blood system.

The minister resisted for six months. I requested that he initiate a full-scale public inquiry into HIV-tainted blood. Thanks to our persistence and the report of the committee he finally relented and agreed to it. I hope that he will not wait another six months to act on the unanimous recommendation of our committee that a national strategy be developed immediately. I therefore ask the minister to demonstrate national leadership, to help physicians in their diagnoses, to help prevent the Canadian public from being unwittingly exposed and finally to provide peace for people who might be infected. They deserve no less.

Mrs. Barbara Sparrow (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I wish to say to my colleague that AIDS has affected Canadians in many ways over the past 10 to 15 years. For those who have received blood or blood products that have been contaminated with the HIV virus the issue has become one that is very difficult for many Canadians.

I want to thank each and every one who has come forth and spoken out with regard to their difficult circumstances. It has indeed been rewarding. Not only did it help us but it helped the committee make its decisions.

The problem with the HIV tainted-blood supply in the early 1980s has prompted other actions. My colleague responded to the subcommittee's report on tainted blood which was tabled in the House probably 10 days ago. Immediately the Minister of National Health and Welfare took action. He wrote to every provincial minister of health with regard to going into this public inquiry with all the provinces and with the other players such as the Red Cross and the Haemophilia Society. They will all

play a major part. The minister gave his word. He has written and he also stated that he hoped to have this public inquiry underway by September 1. This is a result of the good work that the committee did under the leadership of the member for Delta.

In the middle of last April the Hospital for Sick Children announced a plan to notify the families of children who received large volumes of blood or a blood transfusion between 1980 and 1985. They are tracing these because those infants were quite young then and they would probably be around the age of 13, 14 or 15 now. There might be a chance of sexual activity and we do not want any transmission from any youngster who might have had contaminated blood in those days.

With regard to the—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): I am sorry. Your time has expired.

IMMIGRATION

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce): Mr. Speaker, on April 26 I asked the minister of immigration how Sheikh Omar Abdel Rahman was granted entry to Canada last fall. He attended certain meetings here. Sheikh Rahman is an Egyptian militant and the spiritual leader of the extremists who are charged with the recent bombing of the World Trade Centre in New York City.

I also asked the minister if he had conducted an investigation to determine how this individual got into the country. In his usual way the minister did not answer either question but insinuated that under the law in force last year Sheikh Rahman could not have been denied entry. In other words Bill C-86 was necessary in order to deny entry to a person of that kind.

• (1805)

That is completely false. This was confirmed by the minister's senior officials in committee on May 6. The minister should consult more often with his officials.

The law as it applied last fall said: "That the following persons are not admissible to Canada: persons who have engaged in or who there are reasonable grounds to believe will engage in acts of espionage or subversion against democratic government institutions or processes".

It also says: "Persons who there are reasonable grounds to believe will engage in acts of violence that might endanger the lives or safety of persons in Canada and so on".

Last fall we had in force provisions in the law to prevent the entry of these individuals and the individual in question. Those have been in the law for years. As a matter of fact those provisions have been used to deny entry to persons who have been much less dangerous than that individual who got into the country last fall. I have in mind a certain British member of Parliament from Northern Ireland who was denied entry on several occasions, and there are many other examples.

The minister's answer on April 26 was total bombast and a disgrace to this House of Commons. I put a serious question to the minister and deserved a serious answer. We do not want people in our country who might be involved in any way with such terrorist activity as the bombing of the World Trade Centre. This man was also charged a few years ago in the assassination of President Sadat of Egypt.

This evening I am asking once again: How did this man get into Canada? Was there any investigation into this matter?

Mrs. Barbara Sparrow (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, Immigration Canada has no information that Sheikh Rahman was granted legal entry into Canada.

Investigation into the matter confirms, mostly through anecdotal information, that Sheikh Rahman was in Canada in 1991. As was stated at the standing committee on May 6, 1993, Immigration Canada has as yet been unable to confirm if Sheikh Rahman entered Canada in 1992.

As was also stated at that committee meeting, had Sheikh Rahman come to the attention of any of the immigration authorities in 1991 he would most likely have been inadmissible. Today, thanks to Bill C-86 which the hon. member opposed, there is no doubt that Sheikh Rahman would be inadmissible.

It is not truly accurate to say, as the hon. member did on April 26, that thousands of others who are not as dangerous are denied entry every day. The hon. member knows perfectly well that, thanks to government legisla-

tion we have put through, Canadians welcome millions of visitors and we will keep out those people who, as he says, are dangerous and inadmissible.

Over the past three or four years, with the changes to the Immigration Act, we have gone out of our way to protect Canadian society and to make sure that fair terms are legislated.

FISHERIES

Mr. Bill Casey (Cumberland—Colchester): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to again ask a question with some more detail of the minister of fisheries or the parliamentary secretary to the minister of fisheries.

For decades the lobster fishermen along the coast of Northumberland Strait near Wallace, Pugwash and Malagash have been asking DFO to increase the minimum size of lobsters allowed to be caught in those waters. The purpose is simply for conservation, to protect the resource and make sure that the industry stays viable.

For years they have been denied that request. Aside from their request to DFO, about four years ago the lobster fishermen themselves agreed to accept the higher standard for lobsters and in effect today they are throwing lobsters back into the water which they could keep and sell under the law. They have established their own standards which are higher than the department of fisheries.

It seems strange to me that we cannot help these fishermen protect their industry and adopt these standards in the interest of conservation. The answer I always get from DFO is that we cannot divide an area of the fishery and in this case it is area 26. There cannot be one set of standards for lobsters on one side of the water and another set on the other side of the water. There are fishermen on the P.E.I. side who want the lower standard for lobsters.

• (1810)

In another case I have been dealing with oysters and have found there is a special regulation for oysters on Prince Edward Island. If we can have a special regulation for oysters on Prince Edward Island why can we not have a special regulation for lobsters on the Nova Scotia side of the Northumberland Strait?

Mr. Ross Belsher (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency): Mr. Speaker, I wish to again thank the member for Cumberland—Colchester for his vigilant watch over the lobster carapace size in his riding.

A program to increase the minimum lobster carapace size to two and three-quarter inches was introduced in several lobster fishing areas, better known as LFAs, in the southern Gulf of St. Lawrence in 1990 and 1991. The program which provided for four annual increases in minimum size was suspended in 1992, as the hon. member has said, after two increases in LFAs 23 and 25 and one increase in LFA 26-A.

The suspension was in response to concerns raised by some industry representatives and the province of P.E.I. that the full biological, market and economic implications of the changes were not well understood. To address these concerns, in April 1992 the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and all Atlantic provincial fisheries ministers gave their unanimous commitment to undertake an independent study to assess the implications of increasing the minimum carapace size. This comprehensive study was intended to provide answers relevant to making a decision on carapace size before the 1993 season.

The study goes a long way toward answering questions relevant to making decisions regarding carapace size. However the minister announced in March of this year that there would be no changes in minimum legal carapace size for the 1993 season, given the depressed state of the Atlantic fishing industry, the current economic climate and the lack of time available for extensive consultation on the results of the consultant's study before the 1993 season opened.

Gulf Nova Scotia fishermen have now put forth another proposal, as the hon. member has said, to create a dividing line through LFA 26-A so the minimum legal carapace size could be frozen on the P.E.I. side of the line and scheduled carapace increases could continue on the Nova Scotia side.

There are presently four different carapace sizes throughout the southern gulf. The enforcement and management implications of the proposal to create a dividing line at LFA—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): I am sorry but your time has expired.

POVERTY

Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal): Mr. Speaker, I rise today on an issue which I brought to the attention of this House in March and bring to its attention again today. The issue is poverty which was the subject of a

report tabled today by a House committee. This issue is so serious that the United Nations has condemned Canada's inaction in this matter.

Apparently Tories in this government believe the problem is one of defining poverty and not curing it. They seem to believe that poverty can be redefined out of existence; that it will go away and masquerade under some other name. All ten recommendations deal with defining statistics. It says the purpose is to better inform Canadians and the rest of the world about the true state of poverty in this country.

We know how bad it is. Apparently this committee is convinced we do not understand the data. How can the government define away the increase in single parent families seeking food in Montreal by 71 per cent? What would be a new definition for hunger? How could we redefine a hungry person? I do not know. Maybe the government can figure it out.

Maybe it forgot that these numbers represent people who need our help. They mean one million children. The number of children who are hungry has gone up by 180 per cent. They are Canada's future and we are giving them food banks when they need literacy skills. We are giving them a bleak future. A hungry child cannot concentrate and learn to read and write properly when his or her tummy is empty.

Apparently this government sees no need to reduce the 14 per cent Montreal jobless rate, according to the May 5 Statistics Canada report. Do my friends on the opposite side realize that 20 per cent of Montrealers live below the low income line? That amounts to one out of every five people in the Montreal region. To put it another way, 20 per cent of the greater Montreal region would fill the Olympic stadium ten times, and that would be somewhat representative of the hungry and poor in Montreal.

Do my friends opposite realize that 22 per cent of the people in the Montreal region live below the poverty level? This is the highest rate of any Canadian city.

The region needs measures to put our citizens back to work. Montreal needs action which takes people off the bread lines and puts them on the employment roles. Of all the North American cities with a population of over one million, and there are over 40 cities, Montreal places dead last in terms of unemployment, income per capita and participation in the labour force. This is a disgrace. It is an urgent problem for Montrealers.

I ask my question from March again in June: What is this government prepared to do? Where are the concrete proposals for putting the jobless back to work instead of government recommendations to hide the human face of suffering, hunger and poverty behind redefined statistics?

Mrs. Barbara Sparrow (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my colleague, who is a very good member for her constituents in Montreal, that poverty is a very important issue for all of us in this House. When Canadians have to resort to food banks to feed their families and when children go to school hungry it affects all of us. It affects their health and education and the whole future of this country.

We do want to build a better future for all the children. It was a year ago May that the Minister of National Health and Welfare brought out Brighter Futures which directed $500 million specifically at those most in need, and a specific amount was allocated to the native community.

A year ago the Minister of Finance introduced the tax benefit package with regard to rolling in the refundable child tax credit, the child tax credit and the family allowance. We put an extra $2.1 billion into that. This is money going specifically to the homes of families and it is tax free.

The Minister of Employment and Immigration has set aside $3.8 billion to create jobs and train and retrain Canadians all across the country.

We work with our provincial counterparts. Welfare is a provincial jurisdiction but we are all in this together. We will do everything possible within the fiscal constraints that we have to assist all those people who are really in need.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Pursuant to Standing Order 38(5), the motion that the House do now adjourn is deemed adopted. The House therefore stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

The House adjourned at 6.18 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, June 9, 1993

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 31

[*Translation*]

BELL CANADA

Mr. Guy Saint-Julien (Abitibi): Madam Speaker, recently, Bell Canada appeared before the CRTC and maintained that to prevent any deterioration in its financial situation, it would have to increase residential and commercial rates by, respectively, 40 and 25 per cent.

I do not agree that Bell Canada should be allowed to raise its rates at the present time. The general public does not agree either. It feels Bell Canada's profits are adequate and there is no justification for this rate increase.

• (1405)

Bell Canada has no right—and I stress the word "right"—to increase its rates at this time.

* * *

[*English*]

FOOD BANKS

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West): Madam Speaker, this government still does not get it. Yesterday the chair of the government's subcommittee on poverty proclaimed that she saw no reason for people to be dependent on food banks and that there seemed to be little reason in Ontario for the large-scale use of those food banks.

I am certain that her comments came as a shock to a great many Torontonians, including Gerard Kennedy, director of the Daily Bread Food Bank, whose organization has been struggling to meet the already overwhelming and increasing demands being placed on it due to this government's failed economic program.

More than 10 per cent of Torontonians have used a food bank at least once. Over 66 per cent of those individuals are people who have lost their jobs directly as a result of the continuing Tory recession and are not the free-loaders that she suggests.

Rather than closing her eyes to Canada's needy by compelling this government's switch to a new definition of poverty she should instead open her eyes to the harsh reality facing all too many Canadians and show some compassion during these tough economic times.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CONSEIL DES MONUMENTS ET SITES HISTORIQUES DU QUÉBEC

Mr. Marcel R. Tremblay (Québec-Est): Madam Speaker, 18 years ago, the Conseil des monuments et sites historiques du Québec was founded and over the years the council has developed and has earned the respect of the public and professionals alike.

For the first time in many years, the council's finances are in excellent shape. It has paid off all its debts and even has a substantial surplus. The future plans of the board of directors will include investing in partnerships with agencies that will help the council to grow and to fulfil its mandate, which is to protect our heritage.

These partnerships will include, for instance, the Centre d'interprétation de la ville de Québec, Villa Bagatelle, Parks Canada, the Department of Culture and Les Amis de la vallée du Saint-Laurent, Laval University, the National Trust for Historic Preservation in Washington and the Canadian Heritage of Quebec Foundation, as well as members of the private sector who remain one of the pillars of the council's success.

On this 18th anniversary I want to thank the board of directors, especially Chairperson France Gagnon–Pratte, and I hope they are all looking forward to the coming year.

* * *

POVERTY

Mr. Mark Assad (Gatineau—La Lièvre): Madam Speaker, the government is juggling the poverty line statistics in order to hide its failure to take effective action. This is just another diversion, but figures will not change the facts. It is outrageous to use new criteria to try and bury the poverty issue and make us believe the situation in Montreal is not as critical as we think. Because of the high level of poverty in the largest districts of Montreal, one child out of four falls victim to it.

I repeat, the government has no right to hide behind statistics. The government has a duty to seek and implement ways to deal with the problem of poverty, which the government's own ill–conceived and poorly managed policies have institutionalized across Canada, and especially in Montreal.

* * *

[*English*]

NATIVE HOUSING

Mr. Willie Littlechild (Wetaskiwin): Madam Speaker, it has been brought to our attention by the Amisk Housing Association, treaty 6 and treaty 8 areas in Alberta, that recent cuts to urban native housing will have a tremendous negative impact.

The chairman states:

> The federal government has unilaterally decided to eliminate the urban housing program for aboriginal people during the year which this government has recognized as the international year of indigenous people—the cuts will affect the 43,000 off–reserve treaty Indians living in the city and directly affect the approximately 500 treaty families on the waiting list for affordable housing in the Edmonton area.

I join them in asking the House to reconsider this, especially in view of the recent housing report tabled by the aboriginal affairs committee.

RAILWAYS

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona): Madam Speaker, I rise on behalf of the many men and women in my riding and elsewhere in Winnipeg who work at the railway, their families and many other people who are connected with the railway.

I would like to register my objection to the fact that at this very late point in the mandate of the government it has tried to set Canada in the direction of eliminating both the Crow rate and the paying of the Crow benefit to the railways.

The railways have been systematically attacked on a wide policy front by this government through deregulation, free trade and a variety of other ways. This is the final nail in the coffin of the railways. This is not only bad for people who work for the railways but bad for the country and bad for the environment. It is bad policy.

It is about time the government realized that and changed its mind, instead of trying to do in the last few minutes of its mandate what it has no mandate to do and no right to do at this time.

* * *

• (1410)

FESTIVAL CARAVAN

Hon. David MacDonald (Rosedale): Madam Speaker, this year Festival Caravan is celebrating its silver anniversary with an array of 40 international "cities" representing over 70 cultural communities. This festival covers all of metropolitan Toronto and over two million people are expected to visit over its nine days.

Taking place from June 18 to June 26 this year, Festival Caravan was the first international festival in North America. This unique festival has often been emulated yet never duplicated.

Special recognition should be given to Zena Kossar, the founder of Festival Caravan, who for all 25 years has worked tirelessly to make the event the success it always is.

The festival is a celebration of the rich and diverse heritage that is Canadian culture with dance, art and music. It is a wonderful mosiac for all Canadians and international visitors to enjoy, making this year's 25th anniversary an outstanding success.

FISHERIES

Mr. Fred J. Mifflin (Bonavista—Trinity—Conception): Madam Speaker, there are 103 foreign fishing vessels on the nose and tail of the Grand Banks today. They are not allowed to catch northern cod but they will and they will suffer no consequences.

By moratorium rules Newfoundland fishermen are not allowed to fish their own waters. If they do they will be arrested, their boats will be seized and they will be charged and prosecuted. What a shameful and outrageous contrast.

For the past five years the Liberal opposition in Parliament has done everything in its power to induce the Conservative government to put a stop to this pillage and rape of our main resource in Newfoundland.

With speculation now that the moratorium may go well beyond two years, the provincial Conservative opposition is joining the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador in crying out for this federal government to effectively take control of the nose and tail of the banks to stop this illegal and immoral economic, environmental and ecological plundering.

Will the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans in the dying days of this government pay heed to this sound advice, stop illegal foreign overfishing and implement measures that will return the Grand Banks to its rightful owners now?

* * *

NATIONAL ACCESS AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. Bruce Halliday (Oxford): Madam Speaker, last week was National Access Awareness Week in Canada, a time when over a thousand communities across this country took stock of their progress in breaking down their barriers which prevent full participation in community life by persons with disabilities.

NAAW, as it has come to be known, has experienced amazing growth and success over the past six years because of partnerships forged among labour, business, volunteer and public interest groups.

The success of NAAW is evident everywhere, in a host of national programs, in community designed initiatives and here on Parliament Hill. In this regard, I especially appreciate the Deputy Speaker's initiative in building on the commitment and leadership of the hon. John Fraser.

An action plan for Parliament is now in the public domain. We can expect annual reports on progress as we move down the road to a fully inclusive society reflected, for all intents and purposes, by the leading democratic institution in the land.

* * *

DR. HELEN GRAVES

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Madam Speaker, there is one program between Canada and United States that is working very well. Many members of Parliament and political parties have benefited from it.

Over the past 15 years, through a unique program developed by Dr. Helen Graves, almost 300 political science students from the University of Michigan have become acquainted with our people, issues and parliamentary system of government.

By working with members, attending briefing sessions with top government personnel and completing special assignments they have learned about the differences between our two countries. They have also learned about the similarities that allow us to unite in a common purpose. Today these people are at all levels of government in the United States, including the U.S. Congress.

In addition, a number of Canadian students, including our own pages and guides, have participated in a similar program in Washington, D.C.

The success of this program is a tribute to Dr. Helen Graves' creativity, enthusiasm and dedication. I know the House will join me in commending her on the anniversary of this significant program. *Merci bien*, Dr. Graves.

* * *

CONSERVATIVE LEADERSHIP

Mr. John R. Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Madam Speaker, step right up to the Tory leadership three-ring circus, featuring the Tory leadership contenders and their 100 lobbyist handlers.

This weekend under the big top in the first ring, the illusory Jean Charest will make the deficit disappear with the able assistance of lobbyist magician Gary Ouellet.

In the second ring, we have the amazing Jim Edwards who in his effort to cut costs is doing a death defying trapeze act without a social safety net and helped by lobbyist John Laschinger.

Now, for the main attraction, suspended hundreds of feet above us, the unpredictable Avril Phaedra, alias Kim Campbell, will be walking the high wire with the balance pole between her teeth and assisted by lobbyists Bill Neville and Gerry Doucet.

Finally, to keep the crowds happy no circus would be complete without this: "Aren't they a pair, send in the clowns".

• (1415)

Undoubtedly the 1.6 million unemployed Canadians—

Madam Deputy Speaker: The hon. member's time has expired.

* * *

POVERTY

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, a news flash.

As a result of the report tabled yesterday from a tumultuous Commons committee on poverty and if the member for Don Valley North has her way, there will soon be two million fewer Canadians living below the poverty line.

How will this be done? The government intends to do so by lowering the poverty line. Instead of formulating concrete policies to deal with the plight of 4 million Canadians living at or below the poverty line, 218,000 of whom reside in Manitoba, 21 per cent of all Manitobans, the government has adopted a negligent transparent approach of denial and avoidance.

This is unacceptable to Canadians and particularly to Manitobans who face the highest rate of poverty in Canada. The arbitrary redrawing of the poverty line does nothing to help the 72,000 children living in poverty in the city of Winnipeg.

In addition it is simply not true that nearly half the people using food banks are—

Madam Deputy Speaker: The hon. member's time has expired.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

EMPLOYMENT

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Acting Prime Minister.

This morning on the eve of the Tory leadership campaign I opened my mail. Finally after nine years a letter came that said the government had the answer to unemployment. What do I find in the envelope? A leaflet saying: "Sit only when asked" and a brochure saying: "Be friendly with the secretary", and the government offers a conehead dunce cap to the unemployed.

Yesterday the government's solution to the problem of 4.5 million Canadians living in poverty was to erase them from the statistics. Today it tells 1.6 million unemployed Canadians that they are dumb.

How can the Prime Minister justify distributing hundreds of thousands of conehead dunce caps as a solution to the failure of its economic policies?

An hon. member: We want a question.

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance): Madam Speaker, there is no one who is more concerned about the unemployment problem than I and the members of this government.

We recognize as well there are some very clear challenges not only facing Canada but also facing other industrialized countries in the world. I certainly experienced that last week when I attended the OECD ministerial meeting composed of the 24 major industrialized nations.

As a matter of fact there is a comprehensive study on unemployment currently being undertaken that shows that Canada's prospects are the most positive of all the 24 industrialized nations. It is confirmed by the headlines we see appearing in recent newspapers: "Canada poised to top G–7 growth. Canadian recovery has taken a firm hold, says the economic agency", the OECD. "Canada's economy will beat other G–7 countries" says the OECD.

"Canada's economy, the leader in growth" and there are things such as: "Construction spending to rise. A corporate Canada on the comeback trail. The GDP bounces back to strength. The oil patch recovery is surprisingly strong". A poll forecasts more jobs.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Perhaps we can continue with another question.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Madam Speaker, the truth is that more than 400,000 people are living in poverty in Montreal. There are 221,000 unemployed men and women in Montreal, and the government sends them leaflets that say: "Sit only when asked" and "Be friendly with the secretary". The government is also sending them dunce caps. Why does the Prime Minister insult the unemployed by treating them like unruly children?

Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I listened earlier to the question the hon. member for Hamilton East put in English, and I listened to this one in French, but neither makes much sense. I just want to say that to describe the situation the way the hon. member just did is quite easy. Ever since this government has been in office, it has tried to determine the causes of these problems and why we are facing them now. With the help of the Prime Minister, the Minister of Finance, our cabinet colleagues and the government, we have put in place strategies for training, employment and direct assistance, especially to poor people, in order to respond effectively. Increasingly as the Minister of Finance pointed out, the mechanisms we have put in place, including our interest rate policies, are producing results. There are more jobs for Canadians, who are better able to take care of themselves, act responsibly and meet problems head on. As a result, they will very likely never have to revert to the situation in which they were before.

• (1420)

[*English*]

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Madam Speaker, we know the views of the hon. member for Don Valley North on poverty. Now we hear the hon. member for Mississauga South who ridicules poverty saying that with current statistics: "A millionaire can be considered in poverty and go to food banks".

This coming Friday, the Conservative Party will call the retiring Prime Minister a people's champion and an economic genius. It is no wonder that the government—

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Ms. Copps: Madam Speaker, those who are clapping the loudest are those who are not seeking re-election.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Ms. Copps: Is it any wonder that the government is blind to the suffering of millions of Canadians when this is how it sees the role of its job in helping the unemployed. Besides offering them a conehead dunce cap and saying good luck in your job search, what has the Prime Minister to say to 10,000 steel workers in Hamilton who have lost their jobs?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, the hon. member for Hamilton East refers to me as the people's champion and as an economic genius. Sheila, I didn't know you cared.

Ms. Copps: Your minister sent it out.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Mulroney: I have to tell my hon. friend I would be happy if she would table the document to which she refers because I have not—she is ready to table it. I am sure that at an appropriate time she will table it and we will take a look at it. We may be the few people in Canada who will understand what she has been talking about.

Mr. Keyes: It is your minister's.

Mr. Mulroney: My hon. friend Stan says that it is my minister's. Why would that change anything? After all, my hon. friend refers quite properly to a very serious problem in respect to the steel industry. We have been working with the United States and I think quite productively to protect the interests of Canadian steel producers which are achieving a larger market share in specialized areas of the American market than before.

The best way that we can help the steel producers in Canada or any other industry is by producing low inflation. We have the lowest inflation rate in 30 years. We have the lowest interest rates in 20 years. We have the highest projected employment growth rate in 1993-94 of any industrialized country in the world. That is the way we help Canadian workers, by creating durable long term jobs.

Oral Questions

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Bob Speller (Haldimand—Norfolk): Madam Speaker, last month the youth unemployment rate rose to 18.2 per cent. That is 430,000 young Canadians who do not have jobs.

There is a crisis in this country of youth unemployment. I want to ask the minister what new ideas or new programs he has to put these young Canadians back to work and to give them hope. Clearly the old policies are not working.

• (1425)

Hon. Pierre H. Cadieux (Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport) and Minister of State (Youth) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, obviously my hon. colleague was not listening to me when I went before the standing committee recently and explained to the hon. member the initiatives that are there and are working.

The initiatives have been designed to help those youths who are seeking employment and particularly those youths at risk who are thinking of dropping out of school. We are making sure that they do not make that decision if it is possible. They are our future and they need the appropriate tools to ensure that they can face all the coming opportunities.

A strong recovery and a strong economy is exactly what we are giving them.

Mr. Bob Speller (Haldimand—Norfolk): I listened to the minister, but the minister's programs are not working.

[*Translation*]

My supplementary is directed to the same minister. Young Canadians have lost hope. They need a government that understands them. When will the government offer specific programs that will provide jobs for young people?

Hon. Pierre H. Cadieux (Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport), Minister of State (Youth) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, obviously this is a repeat in French of a question that was put in English. Young people will not have to wait, because we are already giving them hope and trying to create the right economic climate, so they will get results as well.

* * *

[*English*]

LEADERSHIP CAMPAIGN

Mr. John R. Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. It concerns the fact that the campaigns of the Tory leader candidates are a virtual who's who of the Canadian lobbying industry. In fact more than 100 lobbyists are working on the campaigns of the top three contenders.

With the Campbell campaign are Bill Neville, Gerry Doucet and Nancy Jamieson. With the Charest team there are Jodi White, Gary Ouellet and Pat MacAdam, among many other lobbyists for profit. The Jim Edwards campaign is managed by John Laschinger and assisted by other lobbyists for profit like Chester Burtt.

Does the Prime Minister not think that his party and his government are sending out the wrong message to Canadians when lobbyists for profit who make their living off government procurement contracts are accumulating political IOUs that can be cashed in with the new Prime Minister?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, I thank my hon. friend for his question. He raises a serious matter, according to him, of propriety.

Mr. Rodriguez: For the country.

Mr. Mulroney: For the country, I see, I am sorry I missed that.

In that case he would be interested in the following statement today that "the leader of Prince Edward Island's New Democrats is quitting his post for three months and collecting unemployment insurance to save the NDP party money".

Some hon. members: Shame.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Mulroney: "The leader"—I use that euphemistically—"of the NDP, Larry Duchesne, 44, says the self-imposed lay-off will save the NDP about $4,000 from his annual salary".

I wonder if my hon. friend in terms of propriety will be on the phone this afternoon to the leader of the NDP in Prince Edward Island.

Some hon. members: Shame.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Madam Deputy Speaker: I will of course recognize the hon. member on a supplementary, but let us be careful that it does pertain to the administration of government.

Mr. John R. Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): In response to the Prime Minister's comments, first of all it has nothing to do with lobbying and second—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

An hon. member: Cut him off.

• (1430)

Mr. Rodriguez: Madam Speaker, second, Mr. Larry Duchesne did not make his money lobbying government for his private interests.

My supplementary question for the Prime Minister is this. The Prime Minister is fond of saying that you dance with the one who brung you. Well, by golly, the lobbyists and the Tories are still dancing. I might add they are not ballroom dancing, they are dancing the lambada.

Given that the Tory leadership candidates are continuing to boogie with lobbyists, the question that I and many Canadians want to ask the Prime Minister is this. Is this not a clear signal that it is better to know the Prime Minister than to be the Prime Minister?

Madam Deputy Speaker: The Prime Minister may want to answer, but this certainly is not in regard to the administration of government.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is there a question about government from the hon. member for Nickel Belt?

Mr. Rodriguez: Madam Speaker, it has everything to do with government. It has to do with the private sector interest interfacing with the public interest and where does the government square on the issue? That is my question for the Prime Minister.

Where does the government come square when private interests intermingle with public interests? Whose interests are protected?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, my hon. friend says that his indignation has everything to do with government.

If I may, Madam Speaker, I do this reluctantly but I will read the next paragraph.

Mr. Fulton: Order.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Madam Deputy Speaker: I want to assure the House that that was not my voice.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Mulroney: No, Madam Speaker, and I can understand why the NDP yelled "order" just as I began the answer.

An hon. member: Be gentle.

Mr. Mulroney: I will be gentle. The NDP leader Duchesne said party officials checked with Ottawa last year and the measures meet federal eligibility guidelines for unemployment insurance. I quote: "It is something the NDP party does every year".

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Madam Deputy Speaker: I think we should continue.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

Mr. George S. Baker (Gander—Grand Falls): Madam Speaker, in a letter sent to all members of Parliament yesterday by the Minister of Employment and Immigration, the minister states: "There are more than one million unemployed Canadians and tens of thousands of vacant jobs requiring skilled workers in Canada today".

In the package the minister is sending to the unemployed, he suggests how to get one of these hidden jobs is by talking to "people you invite for dinner at your home", or one can get a job by "talking to people you meet at parties".

I want to ask the minister of employment what planet does the government think it is living on? Does the minister of employment not realize that it is hard enough for the unemployed to pay for their own dinner, let alone to throw dinner parties?

Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Madam Speaker, I understand why a Liberal is never invited to a party.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Valcourt: The hon. member is talking about a serious issue.

We are talking about unemployed people who need to be able to fill these jobs. Is the hon. member denying there are vacant jobs in Canada right now that cannot be filled because people do not have the skills or do not know about them?

• (1435)

I invite him to come to a region of northern New Brunswick in my riding where the unemployment level is maybe 12 per cent while at the same time, people are looking for employees.

The measure we introduced will help unemployed workers access the vacant jobs that are available. This is a measure that will assist them in their search.

Mr. George S. Baker (Gander—Grand Falls): Madam Speaker, the job search planner the government is going to send to all unemployed Canadians states that the unemployed will be told that most of these "hidden jobs", these tens of thousands of jobs available in Canada today, can be found through "personal contacts". Some of the sources listed for these hidden jobs are "friends, relatives and acquaintances".

Is this hidden job theory of tens of thousands of jobs available not a fairy tale? Is it not just a figment of the government's imagination? Will the minister not admit that the only hidden jobs that have been filled by this government were the 600 government appointments, yes, to friends, relatives and acquaintances of the Tory Party of Canada?

Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Madam Speaker, the hon. member is talking about jobs. GM Canada announced on June 2 the addition of a third shift to the truck plant in Oshawa, creating about 650 jobs. On June 4 *The Ottawa Sun* reported that Concert Industries of Vancouver will be creating 60 jobs in Thurso, Quebec. The Royal Bank is adding 60 jobs in Regina, Saskatchewan. One hundred and fourteen jobs will be created near Wawa in northern Ontario.

All of these jobs have nothing to do with the Conservative Party but they have everything to do with Conservative policy.

* * *

IMMIGRATION

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre–Dame–de–Grâce): Madam Speaker, my question is for the minister of immigration.

The minister recently proposed changes to the immigration point system which would make it more difficult for immigrants who have not completed high school and would give priority to immigrants with university degrees.

Since there are now many immigrants in Canada with university degrees and trade certificates who cannot use this training because their diplomas are not recognized here, what will the minister do to make sure that immigrants with diplomas can practise their trades and professions in Canada?

Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Madam Speaker, the hon. member knows from all of his experience in this House and his knowledge of the jurisdictions that accreditation is a provincial matter.

When we introduced the amendment to the Immigration Act in Bill C–86, which, by the way, the hon. member and his party opposed, I wrote to all my counterparts at the provincial level. We have an interdepartmental officials committee working on accreditation. This will facilitate recognition of these new Canadians coming in with skills, with knowledge and with professions so they will be able to work.

We are working in co–operation with the provincial governments in order to try to find a solution so that these skills can be quickly acknowledged by provincial bodies.

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre–Dame–de–Grâce): Madam Speaker, I understand that much of this is under provincial jurisdiction but I would hope the minister could convince his provincial counterparts. If he is going to make immigration more available for university graduates in Canada, they should recognize these diplomas and certificates.

There are many immigrants who are highly skilled tradespeople but they do not have high school diplomas. Why is the minister making it more difficult for these

persons and why are these people not given some points for the education they do have?

Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Madam Speaker, this government is not making it more difficult. It is making it easier for Canadians to continue to benefit from immigration.

The issue is that with the work force we have in Canada we need skilled people, people with a certain level of education so that when they come here they can enter the labour market.

• (1440)

If I am faulted today for refusing to admit people to Canada without primary or secondary level education, I think it is for the welfare of all Canadians that we are doing this without being unjust to anyone.

Those Canadians that are here are not affected. However those who want to choose Canada as a land in which to prosper and work with us to continue building this great country should have a level of skill and education that would allow them to participate fully. Again it is for the benefit of all Canadians.

* * *

POVERTY

Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare who by now will have had time to read the report of the subcommittee on poverty.

Would he tell the House and the 4.2 million Canadians who live in poverty whether he thinks poverty should be addressed by redefining it, as his committee suggests, or does he think it should be addressed by finding solutions to the problem?

Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Madam Speaker, I hope my colleague does not believe that I read the report overnight and that I am ready this afternoon to answer what I could not answer yesterday.

The question is good in terms of what the government has tried to do since 1984. Once again we can talk about statistics, levels and so on. But what Canadians want to know and what the government is trying to do is find the reasons that we face poverty. That is why we have worked with the Minister of Employment and Immigration for example to train people and to educate them, and the Minister of Finance has worked to keep inflation and interest rates low and so on.

For all those reasons we believe we are moving toward better jobs for Canadians. When people have jobs they are able to look after themselves.

Of course it is not the philosophy of the NDP. The NDP has a lot of suggestions when its members are in opposition but the day it is in power everything disappears. I have looked at three provinces in this country and there are no miracles in terms of jobs in Ontario, Saskatchewan and B.C.

Listen to us and let us try to do the same thing in those provinces.

Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing): Madam Speaker, the minister is right that there are no miracle solutions but I am glad he raised the question of the government's economic policies. I would like to address a question to the Prime Minister on this matter.

In a University of Toronto study today, the government was blamed for making Canada's recession deeper as a result of higher federal taxes and its obsession with inflation, making this recession come sooner and be more severe than for our competitors. The study concluded that as a result of federal government policy 515,000 fewer Canadians had jobs in 1992.

I want to ask the Prime Minister as a parting gesture of good faith to Canadians, would he admit that his government's policies deliberately deprived 515,000 Canadians of jobs?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance): Madam Speaker, whenever these kinds of simulated projections are undertaken in abstract they come up with some rather weird conclusions. This is a very clear case in point.

This study is advocating lower taxes, more government spending, higher inflation, and a devalued dollar.

That is not the policy we are following.

Oral Questions

AIRLINE INDUSTRY

Mr. John Manley (Ottawa South): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport.

Last week in a speech prepared for the National Airline Commission in Washington, D.C., the president of Air Canada made the following declaration: "It is now time to revisit whether airlines should be able to charge anything they want no matter how ridiculous or destructive".

This is nothing short of a cry for help from the president of Canada's largest airline and an admission that the airline industry lacks the discipline to ensure its own survival and with it the thousands of jobs that depend on our two main carriers.

When will the minister wake up and realize that Canada needs an airline policy that encourages survival rather than bankruptcy?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Corbeil (Minister of Transport): Madam Speaker, in the decision handed down by the National Transportation Agency about three weeks ago, these issues were explored very thoroughly. The report makes it clear that the government's transportation policy contains all the elements for members of this industry to manage their business properly, if they are willing to do so.

• (1445)

It is certainly not up to the government to tell airlines what they should charge for their services. We live in a free market economy, and it is up to the people in the industry and the entrepreneurs to set their own prices for their services.

[*English*]

Mr. John Manley (Ottawa South): Madam Speaker, clearly the minister was not paying attention to what Mr. Harris had to say or, for that matter, Mr. Eyton when he came before the transport committee of this House not long ago and also asked for some regulatory measures.

We now know that the future of Canada's airline industry in the absence of some declaration or action by the government is to be decided within months either by the courts or by the financial collapse of one of Canada's major corporations.

Is this what the minister wants? Is the policy of the government not to have any policy until the events just take control and potentially 16,000 jobs are lost in one of Canada's major corporations?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Corbeil (Minister of Transport): Madam Speaker, I suggest the hon. member refer to pages 8 and 29 of the report of the National Transportation Agency which happens to deal with all these issues and contains the answers the hon. member is looking for, namely that the policy adopted by this government in 1987 on deregulation and free competition in the transportation industry, as in other industries, was the right kind of legislation implemented at the right time, and was a very welcome development for users of various types of transportation.

* * *

[*English*]

AIRPORTS

Mr. Joe Comuzzi (Thunder Bay—Nipigon): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport.

The government adopted a policy to place airports in Canada under the control of local airport authorities, with the exception of Pearson airport. In the last three years local authorities have taken over in large centres such as Vancouver, Edmonton, Calgary, and I think one airport in Montreal.

Since this policy was announced a responsive group of Thunder Bay citizens formed their own committee at their own expense and worked hard to have the Thunder Bay Airport turned over to local men and women who know something about the local economy of northwestern Ontario.

For the benefit of this local group and other local groups with the intention of having their airports turned over, would the minister please advise what the timeframe will be for smaller communities in Canada to have their local airports turned over to their control?

Hon. Jean Corbeil (Minister of Transport): Madam Speaker, I commend the hon. member for Thunder Bay—Nipigon for supporting the devolution of local airports to local airport authorities. As he mentioned, it is almost a year since we have devolved the four airports

to local airport authorities. The arrangement is working very well.

Since that time the airport transfer task force has been negotiating with about 10 or 12 other communities in Canada. As far as Thunder Bay is concerned, I am informed the base case documents are being prepared and should be completed in August. This will mean that some time in the middle of 1994, if everything goes well, the Thunder Bay Airport should be transferred to the local airport authority.

Mr. Joe Comuzzi (Thunder Bay—Nipigon): Madam Speaker, my question is for the same minister. The fact of the matter is that the Thunder Bay Airport was advised last week that it would take at least three more years to have the airport transferred. By the time an audit is prepared some time in August or September, plus 18 months for signing the letter of intent, 9 months for the notice procedures and then the preparation of the legal documents, it will be 6 years from its inception.

The minister will understand that this is unacceptable. Will he have the officials in his department accept and adopt the same timeframe as he just outlined in his response to me?

Hon. Jean Corbeil (Minister of Transport): Yes, Madam Speaker, I have absolutely no reservation in confirming to the hon. member that the timeframe I just enunciated will be respected.

The letter he referred to is alluding to the fact that it took three years to complete all these documents for the first four transfers because it was the invention of a new situation. Now that we have had four transfers the mechanism will work much more rapidly.

Again I repeat. In the middle of 1994 the Thunder Bay Airport should be transferred to the local airport authority.

* * *

• (1450)

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. It concerns the fact that over the past year, 9,000 complaints have been registered with the new human rights commission in Mexico, a government commission I might add, set up by President Salinas.

Given the fact there have been these 9,000 complaints, would the Prime Minister not reconsider—and I know it is late in the game—his headlong rush into a North American free trade agreement, an agreement with Mexico, a country in which ordinary people obviously do not have the ability to defend themselves or to advocate on their own behalf without the risk of false arrest, persecution, murder or torture? Just name it; it is all here in the human rights commission report.

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, I have not read the report to which my hon. friend refers. There is a general agreement in countries around the world that President Salinas is an enlightened leader whose tenure marks a very significant departure from the events of the past.

He is widely recognized as a reformer who is trying to improve the lot of low income Mexicans, not by receiving handouts from Canada or the United States but by trading their way to prosperity.

For many years that party has asked that we provide more and more foreign aid, more and more handouts. President Salinas is saying: "No, I do not want any charity. I do not want any handouts. I do not want any foreign aid. What I want is an equality of opportunity to trade into an industrialized market, thereby raising the prosperity of all of my citizens, thereby elevating the degree of social justice in Mexico, and thereby becoming a better partner of Canada and the United States".

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona): Madam Speaker, if the North American free trade agreement is supposed to be such a boon to the Mexican people, maybe the Prime Minister could explain while he is on his feet why the standard of living in the Maquiladora corridor is so abominable.

I asked him a question about human rights abuses reported by President Salinas' own commission. Does the Prime Minister not understand that we cannot have a level playing field, to the extent that such a thing is possible in any event economically speaking, if politically the people are unable to advocate on their own behalf, if trade unionists and others seeking social justice have to fear persecution?

How does the Prime Minister answer that question? What does he intend to do about it? When will he reverse this facile notion that somehow free trade with Mexico will be of benefit to the working people of

Mexico? It is not going to be of benefit to them or to the working people of America or Canada.

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, I ask my socialist friend how we bring about reform in countries around the world. Is it by greater isolationism or by greater economic, social and commercial intercourse with those countries so as to improve relationships, so as to provide them with opportunities and instruments to raise the standard of living, so as to provide them with greater opportunities for social justice?

I understand my hon. friend and the union supporters in Canada have the same union supporters in Mexico. They are protectionists. They want to keep the world the way it is. They refuse to recognize the great currents of globalization that are affecting North America and the world.

We are saying that North American free trade is not necessarily a panacea for all, but it is a step forward in helping all peoples confront the new demands of globalization, thereby raising the prosperity level for all citizens of this continent including Mexico.

My hon. friend should stop penalizing the people of Mexico by trying to sabotage a deal which would give the poorer people of Mexico a greater opportunity to increase their wealth, their families' well-being and their human dignity. Surely the NDP should stand for greater human dignity for people in developing countries.

* * *

[*Translation*]

HIGHWAY RECONSTRUCTION

Mr. Guy Saint-Julien (Abitibi): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transport. For several months the federal government and the provinces have been discussing a reconstruction program for our national highway system. Annually, Ottawa collects $11 million in gas and road taxes.

• (1455)

Could the minister tell the House today whether the federal government will invest in rebuilding Trans-Canada Highway 117 in Abitibi-Témiscamingue and other sections of that highway in Quebec?

Hon. Jean Corbeil (Minister of Transport): Madam Speaker, the hon. member is of course aware that in last December's economic statement, the Minister of Finance announced that the federal government would make $500 million available to the provinces for repairs to highway systems that are part of our national highway network. Highway 117 is indeed part of that network and is one of the items we discussed in our negotiations with the Quebec government, to decide how funding allocated to Quebec in last December's economic statement by the Minister of Finance would be shared by Quebec and Ottawa.

* * *

[*English*]

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Hon. David MacDonald (Rosedale): Madam Speaker, my question is for the minister responsible for external relations and international development.

A year ago at this time the Government of Canada led by the Prime Minister participated in the earth summit and in particular signed two very important treaties pointed in the direction of achieving international co-operation.

In the words of the Prime Minister: "This is not the time in the history of the environment to entrench, to regroup and to return to former positions. This is the time to test the outer limits of what we can achieve together".

One important commitment was to achieve the target of .7 per cent of ODA by the year 2000. This has since been ratified by two parliamentary committees this year. However the estimates of the department have suggested that we will only eventually achieve the target of .7 per cent.

Could the minister indicate what steps are being taken to achieve the commitment made in Rio a year ago?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Monique Vézina (Minister of External Relations and Minister of State (Seniors)): Madam Speaker, I was not at the Rio Summit, but I do know that neither the Prime Minister nor the Minister of the Environment made a commitment to abide by the .7 per cent target in their official speeches. For reasons that will be obvious to all members in this House, we have had to restrict

growth at CIDA, and the .7 per cent objective is a long-term goal.

However, I can confirm that the government, through CIDA, intends to abide by the commitments that were made at the Summit. Having said that, I would remind the House that as a donor country, Canada still ranks second among the G-7. Therefore, CIDA actively supports the follow-up on the Rio Summit, co-ordinates our contribution of $25 million and implements the proposal to convert the debt of ODA countries to use in environmental protection projects, which represents a total of $145 million.

* * *

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre): Madam Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Prime Minister. He will know that this week we learned the Brazilian court refused the appeal of Christine Lamont and David Spencer.

Unfortunately the Secretary of State for External Affairs has refused to exercise the right of the Canadian government to request expulsion. Instead she has said that the families could rely upon a further appeal process or an offender's treaty, knowing full well that those measures would take another five or six years for completion.

In one of his final acts as a member of the government, will the Prime Minister instruct the Secretary of State for External Affairs to request an expulsion order from the Brazilian government as fully required under the Brazilian law so we could end the suffering and imprisonment of these two young Canadians who have already spent far too much time in a Brazilian jail?

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, as the Secretary of State for External Affairs has explained many times, this question of expulsion is not quite as automatic and problem-free as would be indicated.

Also, there are in fact two more levels of appeal. The Canadians along with the other group involved in the kidnapping had a joint appeal for reduction of the sentence which was denied by the judge.

However there is an opportunity for two more levels of appeal. There is a good sense in the Brazilian legislature that the sentences were unduly harsh. If the Canadians were to appeal on their own in terms of what they claim to be a peripheral participation, perhaps they would have an opportunity to have it reduced. In any event they are provided with legal counsel. Our consular people in Brazil are being as helpful as they can be. It is simply desirable they proceed through that legal process.

• (1500)

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre): Madam Speaker, with all due apologies to the House leader, I am making an appeal to the Prime Minister.

It is based very much on the fact that the Department of External Affairs commissioned an independent expert, Dr. Dias, who put forward a report which said explicitly that any further appeal procedure would take another five or six years.

I want to quote from the report: "In this case, specifically, if the Canadian government requests the expulsion of Christine Gwen Lamont, the Brazilian government may grant her an expulsion because all legal requirements have been fulfilled".

It seems to me there is clear reason for the Canadian government to exercise this right. I appeal to the Prime Minister to undertake that initiative today.

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, if it were as simple as my hon. friend suggests then of course it would have been done.

We were informed by the president of Brazil and by the minister of justice of Brazil that the suggestions of any degree of automatic reaction were misleading and unhelpful both to the case and inconsistent with judicial traditions in Brazil.

I raised the matter myself with the former president of Brazil. We engaged the minister of justice in Brazil on this very actively. We have been pursuing this case vigorously and very enthusiastically. We share the deep sympathy my friend expresses for Ms. Lamont and Mr. Spencer.

We thought the decision was very unfortunate as we thought the sentence was inappropriate. Brazil has its own judicial traditions, as do we. One of them is that it is resistant to intrusion and invasion from the political sector as it ought to be.

That being said I have thought for some time that perhaps the best way to deal with this was to secure expeditious passage of the transfer of offenders act in Brazil which would allow us to seek the transfer of Ms. Lamont and Mr. Spencer from Brazil to Canada, thereby subjecting them to review by the National Parole Board of Canada and conditions in Canadian jails as opposed to those that prevail elsewhere.

This piece of legislation passed congress. I am informed that it is before the senate. We are pressing with every degree of energy to have this legislation passed before the Brazilian senate because we plan to invoke it as quickly as possible.

We believe that perhaps the most expeditious way, not the only one, of securing justice and at least some fairness for these two Canadians is to bring about their return to Canada very expeditiously so they will be subject to Canadian laws in Canada, reviewed by Canadian officials and I am sure liberation at a much earlier date.

Madam Deputy Speaker: I am now ready to rule on the matter raised by the hon. member for Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte on Friday, June 4, 1993.

Mr. Dingwall: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am wondering whether or not the usual courtesies have been extended to the hon. member in question.

My colleague is not in the Chamber at the present time and I am wondering whether the Chair or indeed the Table has informed him of this so he could be here to hear the ruling.

Madam Deputy Speaker: I am informed that people in the party were told. If the hon. member would rather wait until tomorrow, I am quite prepared to do so.

Mr. Dingwall: I thank the Chair for the information. I would respectfully request we postpone the decision until tomorrow when my colleague is in the Chamber.

Madam Deputy Speaker: By all means.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

• (1505)

[*English*]

ORDER IN COUNCIL APPOINTMENT

TABLING OF NOMINATION

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to table, in both official languages, a nomination that was recently made by the government.

Pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 110(2), it is deemed referred to the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture.

* * *

[*Translation*]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Charles A. Langlois (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and to Minister of National Defence): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 28 petitions.

[*Editor's Note: See today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

* * *

[*English*]

JUSTICE AND SOLICITOR GENERAL

17TH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Bob Horner (Mississauga West): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present the 17th report of the Standing Committee on Justice and Solicitor General, in both official languages.

In accordance with its order of reference of Monday, May 11, 1992 your committee has considered the four-year review of the act to amend the Criminal Code and the Canada Evidence Act (sexual offences), chapter 19, third supplement, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1985, which formerly was Bill C-15, and has agreed to report it with 17 amendments.

[*Translation*]

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

14TH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present the 14th report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, in both official languages.

The report deals with the effectiveness of the employment programs of Employment and Immigration Canada.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS

4TH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Marc Ferland (Portneuf): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 4th report of the Standing Committee on National Defence and Veterans Affairs, concerning peacekeeping.

The committee conducted a study of peacekeeping. It heard testimony from many experts. It also solicited briefs from the general public and heard citizens' testimony and here it reports its conclusions and recommendations.

I wish to thank personally all the research staff for the support we obtained, as well as all Canadians and experts who appeared before the committee.

[*Editor's Note: See today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

* * *

[*English*]

CANADA OIL AND GAS OPERATIONS ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

Hon. Bill McKnight (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-135, an act to amend the Canada Oil and Gas Operations Act, the Canada Petroleum Resources Act, the National Energy Board Act and other acts in consequence thereof.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 68(2), the motion is deemed adopted.

Mr. McKnight moves that the bill be now read the first time and printed.

Pursuant to Standing Order 69(1), the motion is deemed adopted.

Bill read the first time and printed.

* * *

TRUST AND LOAN COMPANIES ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

Mr. John R. Rodriguez (Nickel Belt) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-447, an act to amend the Trust and Loan Companies Act.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 68(2), the motion is deemed adopted.

Mr. Rodriguez: Madam Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to close an existing loophole in the Trust and Loan Companies Act which allows executives to borrow unlimited amounts of money from their companies in order to purchase company shares.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Mr. Rodriguez moves that the bill be now read the first time and printed.

Pursuant to Standing Order 69(1), the motion is deemed adopted.

Bill read the first time and printed.

* * *

[*Translation*]

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE POLICE RESPONSE ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

Mr. Dennis Mills (Broadview—Greenwood) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-448, an Act respecting violence against women and children and the development of a standardized procedure for police response to emergency calls regarding domestic violence.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 68(2), the motion is deemed adopted.

• (1510)

[*English*]

Mr. Mills: Madam Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to develop a procedure that would have basic principles in connection with domestic violence. This would be a standardized approach whereby emergency calls should be given no less a priority than emergency calls respecting other violence; that police response to emergency calls requires special procedure and training; that the victim, the accused and any witnesses should be interviewed separately and not in each other's presence and that information respecting the incident should be en-

tered in the Canadian police information centre as soon as possible.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Mr. Mills moves that the bill be now read the first time and printed.

Pursuant to Standing Order 69(1), the motion is deemed adopted.

Bill read the first time and printed.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT OFFERS ADVERTISING ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

Mr. Lyle Vanclief (Prince Edward—Hastings) moved for leave to introduce Bill C–449, an act respecting the advertising of employment offers generated by federal funding.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 68(2), the motion is deemed adopted.

Mr. Vanclief: Madam Speaker, I wish to table this bill entitled an act respecting the advertising of employment offers generated by federal funding. If enacted this bill would require employers to make the federal government aware of jobs created by any federal funding provided to them. Those jobs would then be publicly advertised in Canada Employment Centres across the country.

If the bill is enacted by Parliament, Canadians across the country will be better informed and more aware of jobs being created through the federal government's use of taxpayers' dollars. They will therefore be more able to apply for and obtain those jobs through fair access. Currently such jobs are filled through local offices or by offshore workers if qualified personnel are not locally available. These jobs could and should be filled by any qualified Canadian willing to take the job.

This bill will help to put those Canadians on a more level playing field in competing for the scarce job opportunities being created in this country.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank Mr. Rousse, a constituent in my riding, for assisting in the drafting of this bill.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Mr. Vanclief moves that the bill be now read the first time and printed.

Pursuant to Standing Order 69(1), the motion is deemed adopted.

Bill read the first time and printed.

* * *

EXCISE TAX ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

Mr. Robert Wenman (Fraser Valley West) moved for leave to introduce Bill C–450, an act to amend the Excise Tax Act (electric motor vehicles and low emission vehicles).

Madam Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 68(2), the motion is deemed adopted.

Mr. Wenman: Madam Speaker, the main reason most people in greater Vancouver move to the Fraser Valley is for the quality of life: the green open spaces and the quality of the air, but we are losing on both those fronts with tremendous growth.

This bill is the first of three private members' bills that I have been working on in this area. It provides both individual and corporate consumers with an incentive to purchase electric vehicles or vehicles that run on alternative low emission fuels by offering an exemption from the GST for a period to end January 1, 2005.

The second bill will encourage mass distribution of these alternative vehicles in our marketplace through government and a Crown agency replacement program. The third will require 2 per cent of all vehicles purchased by the year 1998 to be low emission or electric vehicles.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Mr. Wenman moves that the bill be now read the first time and printed.

Pursuant to Standing Order 69(1), the motion is deemed adopted.

Bill read the first time and printed.

* * *

EMERGENCIES ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

Ms. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East) moved for leave to introduce Bill C–451, an act to amend the Emergencies Act (protection of ethnic minorities).

Madam Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 68(2), the motion is deemed adopted.

• (1515)

Ms. Mitchell: Madam Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to limit the powers of the Governor in Council to ensure that the emergency powers in this act will not be used in an emergency to restrict the liberty of Canadian citizens and permanent residents on the basis of citizenship of a nation other than Canada.

We all will recall the shameful injustices that were imposed in World War I when Ukrainian Canadians were interned and again in World War II when those of German, Italian and Japanese descent were unjustly interned.

This bill adds the phrase "on the basis of—citizenship of a nation other than Canada" in addition to the existing prescribed grounds and it will not limit rights or impose obligations on the basis of race, national or ethnic origin, citizenship of a nation other than Canada, colour or religion.

I think those groups that are pressing for redress for that shameful part of Canadian history have asked for these changes.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Ms. Mitchell moves that the bill be now read the first time and printed.

Pursuant to Standing Order 69(1), the motion is deemed adopted.

Bill read the first time and printed.

* * *

FREEDOM OF ASSOCIATION ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

Mr. René Soetens (Ontario) moves for leave to introduce Bill C–452, an act concerning the freedom of association.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 68(2), the motion is deemed adopted.

Mr. Soetens: Madam Speaker, first I want to thank the hon. member for Red Deer for seconding this motion. It has been apparent to me in my tenure in this Parliament that many public sector employees are not satisfied with the representation they have received from the unions they are forced to be members of.

This bill gives individual employees the freedom to choose whether or not to associate with other employees for the purpose of advancing their collective employment interests. This bill will also put in place protection measures for those who choose not to associate with a union and of course it affects all employees covered by federal contracts under the Canada Labour Code.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Mr. Soetens moves that the bill be now read the first time and printed.

Pursuant to Standing Order 69(1), the motion is deemed adopted.

Bill read the first time and printed.

* * *

CANADIAN HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

Hon. David MacDonald (Rosedale) moved that Bill S–15, an act to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act (sexual orientation), be read the first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

* * *

CANADIAN ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ACT

REFERENCE TO STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Charles A. Langlois (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and to the Minister of National Defence): Madam Speaker, I move:

> That pursuant to section 139 of the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, an act respecting the protection of the environment and of human life and health, chapter 16, fourth supplement, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1985, the act be referred to the Standing Committee on the Environment, and that the committee undertake a comprehensive review of the administration of the act, including the provisions and operations of the act, and submit a report to the House no later than one year after the review is commenced by the committee.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Does the hon. parliamentary secretary have the unanimous consent of the House to move the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Madam Deputy Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

• (1520)

PAKISTAN

PAKISTAN PEACEKEEPERS KILLED IN SOMALIA

Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River): Madam Speaker, I think you will find consent from all parties for the following motion:

That the House of Commons of Canada convey to the Parliament and people of Pakistan its profound sympathy in response to the tragic deaths of 23 peacekeepers of Pakistan, killed this month in service with the United Nations forces in Somalia;

And that the Speaker convey this resolution to the Parliament of Pakistan.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Does the hon. member have the unanimous consent of the House to move the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Madam Deputy Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

PETITIONS

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES POLICY

Mr. Jim Jordan (Leeds—Grenville): Madam Speaker, the petitions I am presenting today contain several pages of names of people expressing their views in the democratic way. Their concern is the entrenchment of two official languages in our Constitution without ever having been approved by the majority of Canadians.

The people who have signed this petition are asking the government to make amendments to the Official Languages Act based on a referendum put to the Canadian people. These petitioners are asking that this matter be given attention by the government.

SERIAL KILLER BOARD GAME

Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I am rising to present petitions from a number of people in Windsor, Ontario, requesting that Parliament consider amending the Criminal Code of Canada so that violent and degrading materials such as serial killer board games can be kept from being distributed in Canada.

This petition has been checked by the clerk and has been certified as conforming to the rules.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES POLICY

Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on another subject at the request of a number of people in Windsor, Ontario.

This petition requests that the House of Commons pass legislation giving to the people of Canada a referendum on the question of two official languages.

This petition has also been certified by the clerk as meeting the requirements of the rules for this purpose.

EDUCATION

Mr. John Manley (Ottawa South): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions to present that have been certified by the clerk to be in accordance with Standing Order 36.

First of all I have a petition from Canadians in my constituency and elsewhere in the national capital region who are very concerned about educational matters and have asked that the federal government, together with other levels of government, facilitate the standardized testing procedure for students across Canada.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES POLICY

Mr. John Manley (Ottawa South): Mr. Speaker, I have a further petition similar to that just presented by my colleague from Leeds—Grenville. I gather there has been a bit of a campaign with these petitions. I was asked to present it by Mr. John Elkin of my constituency. It has 35 names on it and it asks as well for a national referendum on the policy of bilingualism.

GROSSE ÎLE NATIONAL PARK

Mr. John Nunziata (York South—Weston): Mr. Speaker, I am presenting this petition in concert with the hon. member for Don Valley East and the hon. member for Oshawa.

The petitioners wish to draw to the attention of the House that the Canadian Parks Service of Environment Canada in its development concept for a proposed national historic park on Grosse Île ignores first the tragic truth of the 15,000 Irish men, women and children who, fleeing famine and pestilence in Ireland in 1847, found in Canada only death and mass graves. Second, the service ignores the heroism of the many Canadians who selflessly succoured the sick and the dying, often at the cost of their own lives. Third, it ignores the generosity of the people of Quebec who adopted nearly 1,000 children orphaned that summer and allowed them to keep their own names.

The petitioners call upon Parliament to urge the Government of Canada through the agency of Environment Canada's Canadian Parks Service to ensure that the Irish mass graves are perpetuated as the main theme of the national historic park on Grosse Île and as a permanent reminder of the Irish role in the building of Canada.

This particular petition was circulated by Miss Ann Looney of Wellesworth Drive in Etobicoke.

CANADA POST

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table a very lengthy petition on behalf of my constituents from Kitimat. It has been certified pursuant to Standing Order 36.

The petitioners are concerned that as a result of Conservative government policies, Canada Post Corporation is now centralizing the processing of forward mail from Kitimat, B.C. thus creating less work for Kitimat, B.C. postal workers and resulting in the loss of potential jobs for the youth in the community.

• (1525)

The petitioners call upon this Parliament to stop the privatization of postal services and to stop Canada Post from considering any closure of the wicket services in Kitimat, plus ensuring that the citizens and taxpayers of Kitimat, B.C. have a full service post office which is directly run by the Canada Post Corporation.

VIOLENCE

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, my second petition has also been certified pursuant to Standing Order 36 and again is a very lengthy one.

There are more than 30 pages of signatures of concerned citizens from Terrace, Smithers, Kitwanga, Vanderhoof and Hazelton. They are concerned that many studies have shown a link between violence and entertainment and desensitization to violence in our society.

Since the laws of Canada do not deal with the materials portraying torture, rape and murder as fun including the serial killer board game they therefore call upon this Parliament to amend the Criminal Code so that violent and degrading materials such as the serial killer board game can be kept from being distributed in Canada.

KILLER CARDS

Mr. Ken Atkinson (St. Catharines): Mr. Speaker, I have petitions with thousands of signatures from the St. Catharines–Niagara area supporting the efforts of Mrs. Debbie Mahaffy and her quest to have the importation of killer cards seized at the Canada–U.S. border and to stop their distribution in Canada.

The signers of this petition abhor the crimes of violence against persons and believe that killer trading cards offer nothing positive for children or adults to admire or emulate but rather contribute to violence.

They call on the Parliament of Canada to amend the laws of Canada to prohibit the importation, distribution, sale and manufacture of killer cards in law and to advise producers of killer cards that their product, if destined for Canada, will be seized and destroyed.

Mr. Duane Derreck was responsible for all of these petitions being distributed.

[*Translation*]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. Eugène Bellemare (Carleton—Gloucester): Mr. Speaker, at the request of 68 of my constituents who live in Osgoode Township, I am tabling two petitions asking the government to hold a referendum on the issue of official languages. Although I do not share the opinions expressed in this petition, I am still pleased to do my duty as a member of Parliament in a democratic country and to represent all my constituents, even those who think

differently from me, as on the question of respecting the languages of the two founding peoples, French and English, and who do not seem interested in promoting Canadian unity.

[*English*]

CANADA POST

Mr. Jim Karpoff (Surrey North): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to file two petitions pursuant to Standing Order 36.

One has several hundred pages of signatures of residents of North Surrey condemning the post office for closing the mail sorting plant in Surrey which is one of the biggest in western Canada. It will cost the community $2.3 million in lost wages and will slow down the delivery of mail not only in Surrey but in the surrounding Fraser Valley area as well.

GENERIC DRUGS

Mr. Jim Karpoff (Surrey North): Mr. Speaker, the second petition I have calls upon the government to certainly not proceed with the free trade agreement, particularly as it will mean that we cannot bring back low cost generic drugs for a period of 20 years.

EDUCATION

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table petitions on the very important issue of establishing national education standards.

Having well-educated and literate citizens is crucial to Canada's future competitiveness. It is unacceptable that today about 30 per cent of students drop out before finishing high school and 40 per cent of Canadians have difficulty with everyday reading and arithmetic. These people will find it increasingly difficult to find meaningful and rewarding employment or any employment at all.

The petitioners are calling for the establishment of a national education standards system to protect, promote and improve the quality of education in Canada. A lack of national standards can hide differences in the quality of education offered across this country.

To restore confidence in our educational system I believe along with the petitioners that establishing a national standard is a positive step in that direction.

VIOLENCE

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from residents of my constituency on Cape Breton Island who are very concerned with the recent violent crimes in Cape Breton. They are concerned that this rate of crime is going to increase.

The petitioners call upon Parliament to review the whole question of sentencing people convicted of violent crimes to make sure that the sentences fit the crimes. They also want a review of the Young Offenders Act to see that stricter penalties are applied to violent crimes.

I ask the House for its consideration in this matter.

• (1530)

[*Translation*]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. Ian Waddell (Port Moody—Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I wish to present a petition from my constituents.

[*English*]

Twenty-five people have signed this petition and it has been duly certified. My constituents call for the government to enact legislation for a referendum of the people of Canada binding upon Parliament to accept or reject two official languages, English and French, for the government and the people of Canada, the acceptance or the rejection of the proposed amendments to be determined by a majority of the total votes cast in the whole of Canada together with the majority in a majority of provinces, the territories being considered as one province.

I am duty bound to present this petition.

CHRISTINE LAMONT AND DAVID SPENCER

Mr. Ian Waddell (Port Moody—Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, the second petition is from a number of people on the Lamont and Spencer case which the Prime Minister mentioned today.

They call upon the Prime Minister to return Christine Lamont and David Spencer to Canada, not to serve 28 years in Canadian jails or to wait for a treaty with Brazil, but to ask for the expulsion of these people right now according to Brazilian law. I am pleased to present this petition.

DIVORCE ACT

Mrs. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West): Mr. Speaker, I too am pleased to present a petition pursuant to Standing Order 36 that has been certified correct by the clerk.

It adds 3,000 names to the 5,000 I have already presented in favour of asking this Parliament to take action to amend the Divorce Act of Canada to prevent the separation without due cause of children from their grandparents. It recognizes that children can be denied the security they need when unjustified barriers are placed between them and the relationship they enjoy with their grandparents.

PEACE TRUST FUND

Mrs. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West): Mr. Speaker, I have a second petition from residents from Toronto primarily.

I am pleased to present this certified petition in special tribute to a friend of mine, Mr. Charlie Christie, who worked all his life on behalf of peace.

It calls upon Parliament to establish a peace trust fund which would allow Canadian taxpayers who are conscientious objectors to choose to redirect a portion of their taxes away from military uses to a fund which would use the resources for peace, education, research, humanitarian aid and other peaceful purposes.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mrs. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West): Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the democratic principles of this House and my responsibility to represent the views of all my constituents, I present another petition asking Parliament to hold a referendum binding upon Parliament to accept or reject two official languages, English and French.

SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES RESEARCH COUNCIL OF CANADA

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, in this first instance, petitioners point out that the major challenges facing Canada today are problems such as poverty, unemployment, abuse.

They say that the current merger of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada with the Canada Council being proposed by the government will not help social scientists resolve these particular problems. They want this decision deferred—there is still time to do so—and some consultation to take place and then a decision to be taken by government.

CHILD CARE

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface): In the second instance, these petitioners want child care deductions for families with special needs children and especially for single-parent families with special needs children to be deductible from income.

They point out that some children require facilities which can be very costly and there is really no option. They believe that the current laws are unfair, insensitive and may be discriminatory. They ask that these be reviewed.

EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface): In this final situation, I have petitioners who want child care facilities for workers who need them. They want a reform of the unemployment insurance rules to ensure that there is no abuse of workers. They want the government to create situations favourable for jobs for those who are unemployed and for those who are receiving social assistance. They would like as well the promotion of in-home jobs for mothers or fathers who may want them and they request that there be consultation on future budgets with the people of Canada.

• (1535)

FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. Ross Harvey (Edmonton East): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition signed by residents of Lethbridge and of the Crow's Nest communities in southern Alberta.

They point out to the House that if implemented, the North American free trade agreement will result in further restrictions being placed on the ability of Canada's federal, provincial and territorial governments now and in the future to assist Canadian industry, conserve Canadian natural resources for Canadian benefit and advance needed social programs.

For this among other reasons, the petitioners call upon this House to reject the proposed North American free trade agreement and to recommend to the government that it use the termination clause to end the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. George S. Rideout (Moncton): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I would like to introduce a petition which deals with language and referendum. It is my duty to present same.

[*Translation*]

I would like to say that I share the position of the hon. member for Carleton—Gloucester.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): I am sorry, but the time for petitions has now expired according to the rules.

Mr. Whittaker: Mr. Speaker, I know it is very difficult for you on days like this, but I just want to bring to the attention of the House and to your attention, that often in this corner because we sit over on the far side, we get left out in presenting petitions because of the orderly way in which the Speaker does things.

I want to point out to the House that it appears that over all it is often unfair to those of us who sit on the far side.

Mr. Harvey (Edmonton East): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. It is my hope that if the Speaker tested the House, he would find there was unanimous consent to allow for the presentation of petitions to finish, there being I believe, three petitioners left.

An hon. member: There are only two left.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): It is agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Whittaker: Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate your putting this to the House.

FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. Jack Whittaker (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt): Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. My petition is one where the residents of Greenwood, Westbridge, Midway, Rock Creek and other areas in the boundary country are somewhat concerned over the North American free trade agreement. They say that if it is implemented, it will cause problems for provincial and territorial governments with respect to their natural resources for Canadian benefit.

They are asking the House to reject the proposed North American free trade agreement and to recommend to the government that it use the termination clause to end the Canada–U.S. free trade agreement.

SERIAL KILLER BOARD GAME

Mr. Ron MacDonald (Dartmouth): Mr. Speaker, I have three petitions. In two of these petitions the petitioners wish that the House ban the serial killer board game, first edition, by Tobias Allen.

This particular game comes with a body bag, 25 babies, four serial killer figures, the object of which is to commit murder and the person with the highest body count being the winner. They ask this Parliament to consider banning this type of game from being imported into Canada.

SERIAL KILLER CARDS

Mr. Ron MacDonald (Dartmouth): Mr. Speaker, the other petition I have deals with a similar matter. Other colleagues have raised it today. It is a petition that came about as a result of the efforts of Mrs. Debbie Mahaffy. It deals with a similar subject matter.

These trading cards deal with serial killers. The petitioners do the same as the previous petitioners and ask this Parliament to ban outright the sale, importation and possession of this type of game card.

FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (Okanagan—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the extra time given to present these petitions. A number of residents in the riding of Okanagan—Shuswap, particularly the areas of Vernon and Salmon Arm, are concerned about the impact of the North American free trade agreement on drug prices. They have called upon the House to reject the proposed North American free trade agreement and use the termination clause that is available to the government to reject the Canada–U.S. agreement.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (Okanagan—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, second and very quickly, a number of residents also from Okanagan—Shuswap are concerned about the proposed changes to the Unemployment Insurance Act putting more power in the hands of the employers. They call upon the House to reject the proposed amendments to the UI Act.

FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. Lyle Kristiansen (Kootenay West—Revelstoke): Mr. Speaker, I thank you and the House for the extended few minutes required to present the remaining petitions.

I am pleased to rise, pursuant to Standing Order 36, to present a petition signed by some 35 citizens from the communities of Fruitvale, Montrose, Quesnel, Trail, Rossland and Castlegar, all within the constituency of Kootenay West—Revelstoke.

• (1540)

The petitioners point out that in their opinion, the North American free trade agreement if implemented would result in further restrictions being placed on the ability of Canada's federal, provincial and territorial governments now and in the future to assist Canadian industry, conserve Canadian natural resources for Canadian benefit and advance needed social programs.

The petitioners therefore call upon the House to reconsider and reject the proposed North American free trade agreement and to recommend to the government that it use the termination clause to end the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Charles A. Langlois (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and to Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, Question No. 522 will be answered today.

[*Text*]

Question No. 522—**Mr. Saint-Julien:**

For each year since 1983, has the government spent money on its embassy in Paris and, if so, (*a*) how much went toward the operating budget (*b*) how much toward travel by the various ambassadors who have held the posting, and which ones (*c*) how much toward accommodation allowances, and for whom (*d*) how many people were employed by the embassy every year (*e*) how much was spent on receptions?

Hon. Barbara McDougall (Secretary of State for External Affairs): In so far as External Affairs and International Trade is concerned, the reply is as shown below.

Since the embassy retains financial records for a six-year period only, detailed information for fiscal year 82-83, 83-84, 84-85 and 85-86 is not available.

Embassy Operational Budget

82/83: 4,929,721

83/84: Incomplete information (1,462,375)

84/85: 4,968,591

85/86: 5,658,182

Please note that we cannot supply total operational budget for 83/84.

Ambassadors to Paris

1981-1985: Michel Dupuy

1985-1988: Lucien Bouchard

1988-1993: Claude Charland

Number of Canadians and Local Employees

	EAITC	EIC	DND	RCMP	CSIS	PA	OTHER	TOTAL
1983	231		6	4		2	15	258
1984	230		6	4		2	7	249
1985	227		6	1	2	3	4	243
1986	199		6	2	2	1	4	214
1987	205		6	2	2	3	3	221
1988	207		6	2	2	3	4	224
1989	200		6	2		3		211
1990	197		6	2		3	1	209

Number of Canadian and Local Employees

	EAITC	EIC	DBD	RCMP	CSIS	PA	OTHER	TOTAL
1991	206		6	2		3		217
1992	204	6	7	2		3		222

(a) to (e)	86/87	87/88	88/89	89/90	90/91	91/92	92/93
Embassy operational budget	7,469,380	8,448,974	7,323,305	7,290,882	8,562,965	7,664,198	9,582,371
Ambassador travel budget	27,765	29,366	5,514	21,482	19,050	12,984	5,172
Official residence maintenance budget	32,302	96,417	127,430	130,921	51,230	77,125	198,628
Combined canadians and local staff	see attached						
Ambassador hospitality budget	62,000	79,363	65,587	90,026	106,720	89,722	98,319

EAITC	External Affairs and International Trade Canada
EIC	Employment and Immigration Canada
DND	Department of National Defence
RCMP	Royal Canadian Mounted Police
CSIS	Canadian Security Intelligence Service
PA	Public Archives

[*Translation*]

Mr. Langlois: Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): It is agreed?

Mr. Duhamel: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. On April 21, 1993 I placed the following question on the Order Paper:

> Was a payment of $20,000 made to Senator Pat Carney for the loss of ministerial papers and, if so, (*a*) how was this sum determined, (*b*) how and when were the papers lost, (*c*) what was the total cost incurred by the government with regard to this matter?

I asked the question, of course, because some of my constituents were interested in these matters. That is true and I can show you the letter, if you want.

[*English*]

I guess I am really wondering now because the 45 days have expired and we are getting very close to the end. I am not playing games with this issue. This is a natural question that was raised by my constituents. I would like to know when I can expect an answer.

If my hon. colleague would like the proof that someone else has raised it, I would be delighted to provide it to him.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Langlois: Mr. Speaker, the number of the hon. member's question is on the list of questions which are now in the process of being answered and I hope to be

able to provide the answer as soon as possible, before the House adjourns, if possible.

[*English*]

* * *

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Charles A. Langlois (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and to the Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call Motion for the Production of Papers No. P-19, in the name of the hon. member for Cape Breton—East Richmond.

P-19—**Mr. Dingwall:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all documents, including studies, reports, correspondence and other papers relating to the Westray Mine in Plymouth, Nova Scotia.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Notice of motion for the production of papers No. P-19, standing in the name of the hon. member for Cape Breton—East Richmond.

[*English*]

Mr. Langlois: Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that the hon. member would be in the House because I am going to provide some answers to Motion No. P-19. I will proceed just the same, and if the hon. member is here he can offer some comments.

Documents pertaining to the Westray mine were tabled in the House of Commons on June 4, 1992. Further documents were released to the public on July 23 and September 9, 1992. They total 7,500 pages. These papers may be viewed at the Department of Industry, Science and Technology, 235 Queen Street, C.D. Howe Building, seventh floor, east lobby boardroom, as well as at the ISTC regional office in Halifax, located at 1801 Hollis Street.

The federal government has also released the balance of its documents, some 11,000 pages, to the commission of inquiry established by the Government of Nova Scotia on April 8, 1993 to examine events leading up to the accident and its cause.

The inquiry commissioner has ordered the commission staff to hold all documents in strict confidence until the public hearings resume. In keeping with the federal government's commitment of May 20, 1992 and the objectives of the commission, it would be inappropriate to release the documents to the House of Commons and the public before the commission is free to resume hearings.

In view of the above facts I ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

• (1545)

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Since the hon. member for Cape Breton—East Richmond is absent, would the Parliamentary Secretary to the Government House Leader agree to have this question transferred for debate?

Mr. Langlois: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): So ordered.

Transferred for debate.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of Communications) moved that Bill C-62, an act respecting telecommunications, be read the third time and passed.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of enthusiasm that I rise to take part today in the final debate on Bill C-62 that will be held in this House of Commons.

I am enthusiastic because I believe it is a good day for Canada. It is most certainly a good day for the thousands of men and women who work in Canada's telecommunications industry. It is a good day for Canadian consumers who will have modern legislation to ensure that there is a standard of service they can expect from one coast to another.

I am enthusiastic because Canadians and the Canadian telecommunications industry have waited a long time for modern and forward looking legislation to govern this important and rapidly evolving sector of our economy and our long wait is finally nearing an end.

The Railway Act, which has provided the legislative and regulatory framework for telecommunications in Canada, dates back to 1908. Yet telecommunications networks made up of wires, coaxial cables, fibre optics, microwaves and satellites have long since replaced bands of steel as the foremost transcontinental highway binding this country together. Our most modern and high-tech industry is governed by legislation which is so outdated it is not even used any longer to regulate most rail service.

Third reading of Bill C-62 in the House will take Canadians one step closer to the modern legislative framework we need if this industry is to fulfil its promise as a key catalyst for economic growth, employment opportunities and prosperity.

The progress that has been made in this industry in recent years and the growth that has taken place, an average growth of about 8 per cent per annum right through the recession, indicate that our telecommunications industry is a winner for Canada.

It is an industry that creates jobs throughout Canada. It is an industry that creates opportunities for Canadians. It is an industry that provides services for Canadians that are essential if we are to maintain and build an even stronger standard of living than we have today.

This bill has now been the subject of comprehensive public hearings by two parliamentary committees, the Senate committee on transport and communications and most recently the subcommittee of the House Standing Committee on Communications and Culture. Both studies found there is a consensus that is as broad as it is clear. This country needs a new telecommunications act now and Bill C-62 deserves to be passed into law.

On several occasions I have praised the work of the Senate committee in its pre-study of the bill last year. With determination and most important, with open minds the senators listened to many hours of testimony from the best and brightest figures in Canada's telecommunications industry. The greatest tribute to the senators can be found in the simple fact that many of their recommendations are now reflected in the amended Bill C-62.

After second reading in the House this spring the same challenge fell to the subcommittee of the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture. The amendments made by the committee reflect the members' genuine interest in and awareness of the issues facing the Canadian telecommunications industry and the role that this key industry plays in Canadian society today.

[*Translation*]

Hundreds of people have participated in discussion of Bill C-62. Many excellent suggestions have come forward, and we have both listened and acted.

• (1550)

The changes made respond to key recommendations of the Senate committee, to suggestions voiced by the House subcommittee, by the CRTC, by industry players, including carriers, resellers and cable companies, by the provinces, by the Canadian business community, and by public interest groups representing a wide range of Canadians who depend more and more on telecommunications services. The amendments have improved Bill C-62, without undermining its underlying principles in any way.

[*English*]

While I will not attempt to list all the amendments brought to this legislation, it would be appropriate to touch on a few of the more substantive changes. These include: more clearly excluding resellers from the scope of the bill; better reflecting regional interests in the policy objectives; giving the CRTC the power to exempt classes of carriers from the legislation; strengthening the provisions on federal-provincial consultation, eliminating a proposed licensing regime while preserving firm Canadian ownership requirements; creating a presumption in favour of regulatory forbearance where effective competition exists, while requiring the CRTC to bear in mind the sometimes fragile nature of competition; imposing an important time limit on CRTC decision making while allowing the commission some flexibility to extend this limit only where more detailed analysis of the matter at hand is required and strengthening the CRTC's ability to deal with infringements of individual privacy caused by unsolicited telecommunications.

I want to pick up on this point in particular because when we ended yesterday my colleague from Mount Royal was quite correctly pointing out that there is a growing concern among Canadians about this whole issue of privacy. There is a growing feeling on the part of Canadians that something must be done and done now

by this Parliament to ensure that their rights are respected.

We have written provisions into the bill to give the CRTC the power it needs to intervene, to ensure that the basic rights to privacy of individual Canadians are better respected than they are today.

Members of Parliament on both sides of the House have been deluged with letters from constituents who have complained about receiving telephone calls from auto diallers. They have complained about junk faxes and 976 numbers which have been used in a way that causes them or their families to run up massive phone bills often without realizing the consequences of their actions.

Today the hands of the CRTC are largely tied on a number of these issues. It is important that we bring changes to the law to ensure that the CRTC has the ability to look into these abuses and act effectively on behalf of Canadian citizens to ensure that their basic rights are reflected.

Yesterday my friend from Mount Royal raised a concern as the House concluded its deliberations at report stage about whether the provisions in the bill could interfere with the ability of legitimate survey takers, for example, to do their work. I can certainly assure members of the House that is not the intention of the government nor is it our expectation that the bill will be used in such a way. We are determined to act effectively in response to the concerns that have been expressed by literally hundreds of Canadians to stop abuses which strip away their basic privacy.

All of us know of some particularly egregious cases where auto diallers and junk faxes are being abused which bring discredit to the telemarketing industry. It wants nothing to do with these fly-by-night concerns which bring nothing but grief to people on the receiving end of those messages. They are vexatious for the telephone companies as well because Canadians turn to the telephone companies asking for their assistance and the companies are very limited in terms of what they can do.

The measures we have taken here that we will be passing into law today will help give better protection to these basic rights of Canadians and will respond to a concerted voice of Canadians from one coast to another asking that this Parliament act without further delay to protect their privacy.

• (1555)

In all the areas where we have made amendments I believe we have ended up with a bill that is better and stronger than before. Some people have expressed surprise about the government's flexibility and willingness to entertain these sorts of amendments during this process.

Over the course of the debate colleagues opposite have used various figures to describe the number of amendments. Two weeks ago they said there were over 150. Yesterday they said there were 74. The figure is 51.

The government's willingness to listen to suggestions for improvements to the bill does not demonstrate that this bill is fatally flawed, as some in the New Democratic Party would have us believe. The government kept the commitment which I made at the outset both before the Senate committee and in this House that we would listen with an open mind and accept any proposals that could make a good bill better.

[*Translation*]

My hope is that, in time, efforts by government to act in a non-partisan fashion will be reciprocated by members on both sides of the House. Parliament is here for a reason. And while the road from first reading to royal assent can be long and sometimes frustrating, I believe the journey is most rewarding when all parties forgo dogma in favour of discussion, and conflict in favour of co-operation.

[*English*]

Why waste the time of MPs, senators, witnesses, clerks, researchers, translators, lawyers, officials and staff if no one is really listening? After all, the bill does not belong to the minister or the government; it belongs to all of us. If all the people who care about the outcome have input and consider their input to be meaningful, I believe our accomplishment is that much greater.

I want to express a very sincere word of thanks to those witnesses, members of the House of Commons, members of my own staff, those of my department, senators and others who have done so much to ensure that this bill is responsive to the concerns of Canadians. Their efforts have certainly borne fruit.

When we make this major modification to our telecommunications industry and the structure that governs it we are doing away with the superstructure that was put in place in 1908 and replacing it with a modern one suited to the needs of the 21st century. These people have helped to ensure that the needs of Canadians, especially those working in this industry, are respected in the bill itself and reflected in the new legislation that will be put in place.

That collective effort and generosity that was shown by so many people and their willingness to collaborate, work together, listen and search for common solutions to challenges have helped to strengthen this bill and ensure that Canadians will be better served for the future with modern, forward looking legislation.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, allow me to return to the three fundamental principles which guide Bill C–62. They are: to ensure that Canadians have access to affordable and reliable telecommunications services; to increase the competitiveness of the Canadian telecommunications industry and to promote Canadian ownership and control of the Canadian telecommunications infrastructure.

[*English*]

The last of these three principles is fundamental to the achievement of the first two. Telecommunications serves to link this country together through a wide range of activities from personal conversations, data and information transfers to business transactions and increasingly to the enjoyment of cultural products and services.

The telecommunications system is in a sense the country's central nervous system linking all other elements with each other. I take pride in the fact that the first Canadian telecommunications act will enshrine Canadian ownership and control of this vital infrastructure as one of its key public policy objectives. I am particularly pleased that the objective of Canadian ownership and control is strongly supported on both sides of this House.

I recently returned from the Asia Telecom Conference in Singapore where I had an opportunity to meet with communications ministers from Asia. I also had the opportunity to meet with representatives of industry from around the world.

• (1600)

I continued from Singapore to Beijing in support of Canadian business and its attempts to sell equipment and services from Canada to a growing Chinese marketplace.

It is striking when one realizes that in China each year between now and the turn of the century the Chinese people will be adding as many telephone lines as we have today in Canada. Virtually every Canadian has access to modern telecommunications services today while in China, as in so much of the world, only a tiny fragment of the population has access to such services.

In Canada, the second largest country anywhere in the world, we have been able to build the world's best telecommunications system. It makes it possible for someone in Pond Inlet in the Arctic to pick up a telephone, be linked to the satellite and talk to someone in any other region of the world. Our telephone system helps facilitate the provision of goods and services across Canada.

When we take a look at the needs of developing countries such as Mexico or China, success in industrialising and improving the standard of living and quality of life for ordinary people will depend directly upon the infrastructure which is in place. Business cannot locate in a country if it is impossible for it to communicate with its customers and its head office which may be located thousands of miles away.

The goods and services necessary for a growing population cannot be provided without a modern telecommunications system. We cannot attract new industry. We would have a hard time providing services for tourism, banking and financial institutions of all sorts unless we had a modern telecommunications infrastructure firmly in place and Canada has that.

We are determined to ensure that this infrastructure remains in Canadian hands, continues to serve the needs of Canadians and grows with the future. We are determined to use this Canadian base which we have built as a means of launching trade from Canada around the world; as a means of giving literally thousands of Canadian working people the opportunity to produce goods and services which will help to improve the quality of life of people throughout the whole of the world.

This country is making an important contribution. It is an important contribution that this industry, which is now being given modern effective legislation, can make to the rest of the world.

We are determined to ensure that this is a Canadian industry. We welcome competition. We welcome the opportunity to compete in the rest of the world. We are determined as well to ensure that the Canadian men and women who have built such a successful industry in Canada will continue to be able to do so in the future.

I would note parenthetically that perhaps the most unique contribution of the debate was made yesterday by my friend, the NDP House leader, the hon. member for Kamloops. He said that the government's policies would lead within a short time to Canadian telephone operators being replaced by Mexicans based in Guadalajara or in Ensenada. Let me quote his words exactly as they were recorded on page 20511 of *Hansard*:

> I am going to make a prediction that would say that within a short period of time when you, Mr. Speaker, or others dial an operator to get information for a particular number the voice you will hear at the other end of the telephone will sound more like *Buenos noches, senor.* In other words, the telephone operator will be operating out of Guadalajara, or out of Ensenada or out of a community along the Rio Grande River.

I do not think my hon. friend really has to worry about the prospect of B.C. Tel being bought up by Taco Bell. Instead we are ensuring that there are opportunities for Canadians to be able to provide services in Canada and be able to assist our friends in Mexico in developing the infrastructure they need to provide the quality of life that all citizens, irrespective of their country, want to enjoy. The North American free trade agreement opens up a multibillion dollar Mexican market for Canadian suppliers. It is an opportunity that is welcomed by the Canadian industry and one that may help to create hundreds of thousands of Canadian jobs and greater prosperity. By building upon that strong domestic base that Bill C-62 encourages, Canadian industry and Canadian workers are able to take advantage of an international market for telecommunications equipment and services which will total in the hundreds of billions of dollars between now and the turn of the century.

• (1605)

Some people sell Canadian business short and they sell Canadian workers short. They believe that it is impossible for people in this country if we take down tariff barriers and encourage competition to be able to succeed either at home or abroad. This industry has proven them terribly wrong.

All one has to do is to travel outside of Canada and see the amount of Canadian telephone equipment which is being sold by workers who have built and designed this equipment here in Canada and who have worked entirely from a Canadian base to recognize that Canadian workers and industry are as good as the world has to offer. Those faint hearts who argue that we should hide ourselves behind tariff walls simply sell Canadians short.

What Canadian workers are looking for and what Canadian business is looking for is opportunity. They are not seeking to be walled off from the rest of the world. They are not seeking to hide in shrinking markets behind high tariff walls. They ask for the opportunity to compete on a fair and even playing field and the opportunity to be able to sell their goods and their services throughout the world.

That is indeed what we are achieving with Mexico. It is something which will be of benefit to the Mexican people and which will certainly be of benefit to Canadian workers and Canadian business as well.

We have seen that Canadians, given the opportunity, can certainly triumph. As an example of that, in China today there are switches either already in place or already contracted for that are made by Northern Telecom. This provides telephone service to four million Chinese. Northern Telecom among other Canadian suppliers continues to bid on contracts in that part of the world and the prospects look very encouraging indeed for them. What they need is not to have impediments to trade but to have the opportunity to trade and to produce goods and services in Canada and to sell them abroad.

The same applies to Canadian consumers. Colleagues opposite have made the point. We are indeed moving to a very different philosophy here about how we should be providing telephone service in Canada. We are moving from a philosophy which said that we should protect

monopolies and have those monopolies located in each of the markets across Canada providing service to consumers.

Last year in an historic decision on long distance competition the CRTC mandated that competition in the future would be allowed for long distance service for Canadians. There are some Canadians who oppose that and believe it is not desirable for Canada or for Canadian workers that competition should be able to exist. I believe they are wrong. We have seen the benefits of competition, rates coming down and opportunities being created.

We have also seen jobs being created in Canada as a result of competition. Jobs have been created directly in the telecommunications industry as they will be in the constituency of the House leader of the NDP where an announcement has been made by one of the companies providing long distance competition that it was their intention to create a new service and new jobs in that constituency. We are seeing it created across the country. As a result of competition we are seeing that as rates come down Canadian business people are able to obtain telecommunications services less expensively, as are Canadian consumers from one coast to another. Some people argue that it should not happen and that it is not in the public interest that it should happen.

However, what would happen if we maintained and followed the policy of some that rates should be artificially high for long distance and that competition should not be allowed? One of the costs of doing business for Canadian companies is indeed the cost of telecommunications services. If these services were available much less expensively south of the border would there be an incentive for these Canadian business people to remain in Canada and to create their jobs here or would the incentive be to take those jobs out of Canada and move them to some other country? Unless we have modern telecommunications services available in Canada at competitive rates we will have a hard time developing our economy, creating the jobs in industry and providing the services that we believe Canadians from one coast to another are entitled to have.

• (1610)

Canadians are not afraid of competition, they welcome it. They are not afraid of increased services, they welcome that. They are not afraid of moving to the marketplace, they welcome the fact that the marketplace will be more effective in the future.

We have seen the effects already in cellular, not just in Canada but around the world. In those countries which took the model of licensing a monopoly, the penetration of cellular service is universally lower than it is in those countries which mandated competition. Prices are higher. Service has not been extended as far. Why? Because one is dealing with a protected monopoly instead of dealing with a marketplace in which the consumer is king and in which the needs of the consumer are put ahead of every other concern.

Today with the legislation which governs our telecommunications industry at this moment it is against the law for the CRTC to refrain from regulating. It is against the law for the CRTC to say that the marketplace and free market competition is doing a good job for consumers and that it does not make sense to delay the introduction of new services or to require costly regulatory hearings. This is costly both for taxpayers and for consumers who have to pay the bill passed on to them by the companies. That is simply not allowed. The CRTC is required by law to regulate and to go through this costly and cumbersome procedure which denies timely improvements in service to consumers and drives up costs both for consumers and for taxpayers. How is the public interest served if we allow this to continue for one more day? How are ordinary Canadians served by that sort of action on our part as Parliament?

The CRTC is there and will remain there in order to intervene in instances where the marketplace cannot do the job fairly and effectively. That power is not circumscribed. It is there and it remains undiminished. In those instances where the marketplace can do the job better we are saying it is time to move away from protected monopolies to free market competition. Every single Canadian in every part of Canada will be a beneficiary as a result of the action that we are taking.

All these principles which underlie the bill are important for Canada. They are important for building for our future, giving opportunities to young Canadians and ensuring that the quality of life that we are privileged to enjoy as Canadians is maintained and enhanced. This is because without innovations in telecommunications it is impossible for us to move services out to the rural and

remote areas throughout Canada where we are expecting that new services should be provided.

By bringing in new legislation, encouraging our industry, giving opportunities to the men and women who work in Canada's telecommunications industry and showing vision by putting in place an electronic highway system to tie together every home, business and governmental institution in Canada we can broadly democratize the provision of services in Canada. We can make it so that people in the most rural and remote parts of Canada have access to the same quality of services as people have in the hearts of the great cities in Canada. We can make it so that people who are living with disabilities have the opportunity to work from their own homes and be able to participate fully in the labour force. We can make it so seniors or single mothers will have the opportunity to continue to participate fully in the labour force and to do so from their own homes to improve their quality of life and to make a contribution to our economy as a whole.

However, it requires that we have modern legislation in place and that all of us involved with the industry and with government show vision and a sense of direction for Canada.

• (1615)

Often when we talk about Canada's telecommunications system and about the importance of telephone service the debate gets relegated to the business pages if it gets covered at all. Often there are many other elements of debate in this House which draw much more attention than what we do for our number one high tech industry in Canada.

It is an historic day for this Parliament and it is an historic day for every Canadian that we are now finally moving to put this modern legislation into place and to ensure that Canadians can plan for the future with confidence, knowing that they will continue to have a Canadian-owned, strong, national telecommunications system.

The principles underlying Bill C-62 have now been endorsed by the Senate committee's pre-study, by the House of Commons at second reading, by the subcommittee of this House charged with reviewing Bill C-62 and by the vast majority of witnesses who have made submissions on the legislation.

The telecommunications industry, its major users and the regulator are unequivocal in their message to this House. Canada needs a new telecommunications act. Bill C-62 is that act. It has been thoroughly debated, studied, amended and improved and it must be passed today so that telecommunications can take us to the very bright world of tomorrow.

Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal): Mr. Speaker, it is really a privilege as well as a pleasure to rise on behalf of my constituents and on behalf of the Liberal Party of Canada to examine and discuss a piece of legislation that is important to the economy, business world and ordinary people of this country.

It is the responsibility of the opposition party to scrutinize this bill on behalf of the people of Canada. That is our role and responsibility. I, as a member of the opposition with respect to this bill, and all sides of the House looked at this bill, made comments at all levels of this House, whether it was in the Senate, in the House itself or in a committee which was a subcommittee of the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture.

There is no question that this bill is a very important bill. I think the minister in his speech outlined a large area of potential involvement and active participation right now in the areas that are impacted by this particular technology and by this kind of infrastructure and areas in which telecommunications touch our lives.

There was no question that new legislation was needed. By the way it was interesting that new legislation was tried in this House in 1977 and it died on the Order Paper in 1978 I believe. I think the most important part of this whole approach was that not only did we have to have a new telecommunications bill, but that it had to be right. There had been such dynamic change that we really had to have a very forward-looking bill.

I would agree with what the minister has just said. Yes, it is the central nervous system of this country. It is important for Canada for many reasons. It is true that this is Canada's electronic highway for the 1990s. There are 100,000 Canadians who work in this industry. It generates over $20 billion worth of revenue. It invests heavily each year in Canadian research and development

in new technologies, plants and equipment. It is a significant industry in a variety of ways.

All this is made possible by tapping the resources of highly skilled and highly trained Canadians. Our work force is one of which we can be very proud. It has certainly gained a reputation internationally if not, as well, right here on our home territory. We hope that this will continue and grow in the future because this really is a winning sector of the economy for Canada. There is no question we have become far more efficient and far more effective which was part of the battle behind the maintenance and the growth of the Gemini services that Air Canada had.

• (1620)

However, let us not forget that when we automatically make the reservations necessary to go by plane, when we can set up a hotel reservation, when we can make changes where necessary to fit our tourists' interests, when we need to use a card at a banking machine because it was inconvenient to get to a bank, even the banking transactions, the business transactions, the stock market transactions, the distribution of all cultural products, all these various industries hinge on an effective, well-implemented, competent and capable telecommunications infrastructure. It is a strategic industry for our entire economy and it helps other industries to compete by giving them access to the information and communications revolution which has been going on.

This helps us to create the knowledge-intensive, high technology jobs of the future and it helps us to locate them where people are, outside of traditional business centres particularly in our regions. It meets the need for home industry today and certainly meets the needs of the disabled who can work more effectively and efficiently from their own homes without being disaccommodated in many ways. This is not to say that we should not also make improvements to the work place so that people of all competences have access at any time.

This highly regulated industry requires the appropriate policy, legislative and regulatory environment in which to succeed. That is why we are here today. Yes, we want to serve the public interest first with a balanced approach among the regulator, the monopolies and complete deregulation. Governments do have a role. This bill looked to find balance among all the competing interests as we sought a design based on the original bill that was placed before the House last February 1992.

I have given this a great deal of thought. I have been involved in this since I came into this House. I have called on the government to keep its word and fulfil its commitment, particularly over the last five years. I want the government to get moving and to back up what it had to say in 1984 about the need for a modern legislative framework for our telecommunications industry.

For nine long years that was just another broken promise. As the government failed to respond to its own promises, the Liberal Party called many times for the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture to study the telecommunications issue. We had our own life in this Parliament but it was never convenient to get it on to the agenda. It always came second or third as a priority.

Therefore, let the record in this place show that in my role as critic for communications and culture I raised, on an ongoing basis, the need for us to address this issue in the standing committee. We needed to address and examine the shortcomings of this industry's regulatory process, to examine the issues of competition, of monopoly versus duopoly and the development of this key industry infrastructure as an instrument of competitiveness, but it was never done.

The standing committee never got around to it, notwithstanding urgings. I think the country may have suffered from our inability to address this issue over time. Never did this government sit down, to my knowledge or to the knowledge of the general public, and look at the telecommunications industry, study how its various components worked together and then look at the 1908 Railway Act and say: "Canada is falling far behind. Let us act now".

Meanwhile, it is true that certain conversations were held in ministerial quarters over time. A committee was set up to take a look at convergence. None of this came into the public arena and certainly not in time for this bill. Meanwhile, Telesat was introduced and privatized. Teleglobe was privatized. Competition was introduced in the long distance market and as well cellular phones were introduced non-regulated. Pocket phones are on the horizon. In fact new technologies like we see with

Newbridge and digital highways are sprouting almost every day.

• (1625)

We regret that the government never produced a white paper, a green paper or a thorough public review of the telecommunications issues. It never developed a national strategy that could be reviewed and examined. This flawed bill was the result.

Our greatest regret is that the Conservative government opposite put this issue on the front burner when it was elected in 1984, yet it stayed on the back burner ever since. Only since last February 7, 1992 after eight years of waiting did it finally introduce Bill C–62. It was April of this year when the bill received second reading and on April 20 it went to the subcommittee of the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture. It was reported to this House on May 28.

We in the Liberal Party have supported this bill moving forward, not because the minister has done a wonderful job, not because it was a good bill when it was introduced, but because we knew this industry and the business community believed it to be an important bill, one that it could live with and one that we could live with for the moment if amendments were brought forward.

In my years as the communications and culture critic for the Official Opposition I have seen communication ministers come and go. However never did I expect the weak leadership that we have seen in this area of telecommunications.

The minister has failed. The government has failed to consult, to build a national consensus on the future direction for this industry, leaving Canada with its 1908 Railway Act, designed for the horse and buggy era in place and not ready or able to cope with this information age. A more constructive, open process would have included perhaps a redrafted bill instead of the dozens and dozens of amendments that we had to make in committee.

The government and this minister indicated that they were open. We can measure the impact of that promise by examining the procedures with this bill. Essentially they could have improved their credibility after the Senate undertook a pre–study of this bill and made a myriad of recommended changes which the government for the most part chose to ignore at that time. Until the government was convinced by the House committee many important amendments were not made.

This is not to say that all were not made but certainly some very important ones were not made. It took the insistence of the committee to force those changes.

Yesterday we were treated in this place to a very sad display on the part of the Minister of Communications as he somehow felt that he had to make a case for his work and his own bill by blaming the opposition for delay and replaying some statements from the past. He just did not get it.

I do not understand why he does not find it ironic that I produced a discussion paper on telecommunications, flawed or otherwise. I did not have the government's staff and all the bureaucracy behind me but I sat down with two staff people in my office and drafted what I thought would be the beginning of a discussion that we could have with the telecommunications people.

It may have been flawed in the minister's eyes but certainly it was a first step. It is ironic that I produced that paper and he never did. It is ironic that this government never produced any kind of discussion paper. Does the minister not realize that in damning the opposition he actually showed that we have been more active on this file than the government?

The point is that this minister and this government waited nine years to make this bill a priority. Now the minister wants everyone to jump on board, say he has done a wonderful job and forget the years that the government has been ignoring the issue. To say the least, that is asking a lot.

If the minister wishes to go back to the past and have his little researchers find my words calling for a new Telecom bill, then so be it. However if he wants statements from the past I have a few others for him so that *Hansard* and the history books can be complete.

• (1630)

We can begin with the former Minister of Finance's November 1984 economic statement. He said. "There is a clear need for a national telecommunications policy to take advantage of the opportunities presented by rapidly

advancing technology and the growing demand by Canadians for new telecommunications services".

He went on to say: "Through regulatory reform the government can spur innovation and provide a major stimulus to the Canadian economy". Then for nine years nothing happened.

We can go back to a speech by the hon. member for Frontenac to the Canadian Bar Association on February 12, 1986 when he said: "The fundamental revision of the policy and regulatory framework which allows the telecommunication industry to realize its potential has thus become a priority for me and for the government. I tackled reforms head-on while establishing the basic principles that should inspire it". Again for nine years nothing happened.

Then there was Madam Flora MacDonald and the minister's 1987 paper called *A Communication for the 21st Century*. She said: "In spite of our past achievements in communications, Canada has not reacted to the changes that are taking place in our own economy and the larger world in the same way as other advanced industrial nations. We have been content to rest on our laurels, to cope with the challenges of the new environment. It is time to call this complacency into question". Again for nine years nothing happened.

We heard the present Minister of Communications who tabled Bill C-62 in February 1992 saying four months later at the Senate pre-study: "To delay its implementation would be to slow the growth of an industry which is vital to the Canadian economy".

That was almost a year ago the minister spoke those words of urgency and this bill is only now proceeding, nine years later, nine years late, at the very dying moments of this government's mandate. At death's door we have finally through pressure in the industry and through lobbying by that industry got the House leader to recognize that the Minister of Communications had an important bill that had to get through this House. It shows the commitment of this government from 1984 until now. Not only that, democracy was not allowed to rule here. We had time allocation on the bill.

For my part when Bill C-62 finally came forward I was prepared to look past the minister's slow handling of this bill because the Liberal Party wanted to ensure a piece of legislation that worked for Canada. I believe the committee process worked very well. Our interest was in ensuring that the committee did a very thorough job and I believe the committee did.

To all those colleagues on all sides of this House who participated I think we enjoyed the process because it was open. It did respond by making many changes that improved this bill immeasurably. To the witnesses, the lobbyists, the lawyers, the staff, and the researchers I say a hearty thank you in the interest of this industry which is vital to this country.

At legislative committee we wanted to make sure that we heard from some of the groups that had been given no opportunity since the Senate report of last year to put their concerns on record and we did that. I must say that the minister did at least respond favourably when I asked if it would be all right if the CRTC sat at the table with us and if the interveners from the business sector could also have their word to say. That was agreed to by the minister and the chair for which I think we can be very pleased.

Since the Senate report of last year it was important, as no one has been heard from again, to put the concerns on the record of this industry and the various partners and players. At different times throughout the course of our hearings Stentor, the resellers, B.C. Tel, CanCom, Telesat and the CRTC were represented at the table. Unfortunately the artistic community was not so represented.

I know it may have seemed like an unwieldy process at that time but it was very helpful to have the industry's views on the record as we went through clause by clause and made the necessary changes. A better bill resulted. The minister can go back and look in *Hansard* and he will see that I indicated there were 51 amendments and 150 changes in wording within the bill.

• (1635)

What should the goal of a telecommunications policy be? What should the goal of a telecommunications architectural structure be? It was meant to provide a fresh direction for the telecommunications sector so that we could maximize the benefit to every Canadian of the world-wide information revolution. This is not only for the people who use their phones at home to call their mother, sister, husband, office or whatever but also to allow businesses to profit from the use of efficient and effective telecommunications and fair and competitive prices in the conducting of their business. I believe the cost of telecommunications is almost one-third of indus-

try's costs. It is certainly so for the medium and large businesses.

It was important for us to update and ensure that the system and the regulator could effectively put into place the terms and conditions that were needed. We also must ensure that this system helps in terms of learning, literacy, education and training and communicating for cultural, social and business reasons.

It brings all the marvels of this revolution from our biggest cities to our outermost communities. This bill as introduced last February was really not what this country needed. However through the committee's efforts it is a better bill for the short term.

Let me turn to a number of issues raised in this bill because we cannot address them all here today. I will address just a small number. Liberals supported this bill, which was acting on the AGT Supreme Court ruling which found largely in favour of federal jurisdiction over telecommunications. Canada needs harmonized rules and regulations governing this sector if all Canadians are to have equal access to the benefits of the information revolution.

In terms of the definitions as we find them in clause 2, there was much study in the Senate on this question and again in the House committee. Should resellers be in or out of the legislation? The indication was that the will was to have them out of legislation. Should this be done by definition or by exemption? That was the key question. My view was that they should be exempted from the act or they should benefit from forbearance.

It was somewhat ironic to see the CTA, the resellers' association, initially fighting to be left out through an exclusionary definition but in the end agreeing to the approach of pursuing forbearance or exemption. I am glad that in the end it got its act together and realized what was going on. However it was too late and the minister did not react. We are left with a complicated definition and we will have to judge its workability over time.

I believe the House of Commons committee did not adequately address so-called hybrid carriers, those that are part reseller but own some facilities and therefore are part carrier. This was not totally cleared up in committee. They should have been addressed at greater length. Perhaps that will be up to the new Parliament.

Much was said at committee with respect to the objectives of this bill. I would agree with the three goals the minister outlined: access of everyone to an affordable telephone system, increased competition and the promotion of Canadian ownership. These were major goals. I am not going to review all the discussions that took place on the definition and the outline of the objectives section. The record should show that many groups felt that greater clarity was needed in the bill to differentiate between the means and ends.

We also discussed culture. In committee the government assured us that the bill could fully respect Canada's cultural interests as new technologies evolved. However some questions remained in the eyes of the arts community. Only time will tell.

Where is the clear direction in this bill with respect to the potential convergence of our cables and our telephone services? We just had a major decision from the CRTC on the future of cable and this fall the commission undertakes a full review of telephone regulation.

I see two tracks here. I am concerned that some areas of cultural activity missed by the Broadcasting Act will also be missed by the Telecommunications Act. Which bill captures what in this no man's land, or no person's land? I do not know and perhaps we will have to see it addressed in a bill that puts a *chapeau* over the whole thing.

• (1640)

There should be no gap or potential gap between the two pieces of legislation in this regard. We really have to look at the whole question of convergence. A 200-page study was undertaken by government but it certainly was never circulated and unfortunately the industry and general society were not in a position to respond to it. The bill does not address it in that manner.

Mr. Keith Spicer, the chair of the CRTC, was quoted in *The Globe and Mail* yesterday as saying that the commission was probably going to have to do some serious work at dealing with the convergence of telephone and cable.

There is a section with regard to the power of direction. It is a new power, and I think it is an important one, allowing the Governor in Council to provide policy guidance to the CRTC on telecommunications matters. Liberals support the general intent of directives from cabinet on broad policy matters so long as it is used judiciously.

However for a sense of balance I am pleased that the committee was able to force the government to add a refer-back option to its vary or rescind power under clause 12 so that the CRTC would not become simply a rubber stamp. We did not want a situation in which cabinet could issue a direction through the power of direction to the CRTC beforehand, and then insist on varying or having the right to vary or rescind the CRTC decision on the same subject matter after the fact. I am going to address that in a few minutes.

The question of exemptions from the act was examined very closely. I felt very strongly that the minister or the Governor in Council should not issue exemption orders, and the Senate agreed. The minister agreed to move the exemption power to the CRTC, which I was very glad to note. However it was not without some very strong interventions at the committee stage. This is one area where Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition contributed to a better bill in a very real and substantive way.

The Liberal Party felt very strongly, as did the Senate, that the vary or rescind power should be substituted with the set-aside or refer-back power as it presently exists in the Broadcasting Act and that a timetable should be established for cabinet to deal with such appeals. I also agreed with the Canadian Bar Association that clause 12 on vary or rescind needed to be amended so that the cabinet in making its decisions must exercise this power in a manner consistent with the purposes and objectives of the bill.

Quite frankly, we knew that the minister would refuse to limit or remove the cabinet's power to vary CRTC decisions. They did give some examples as to why it was important that this be maintained. Therefore our approach was that the minister had what seemed to be some very sound reasons so we left that but said that at the very least he must allow for a more open process, a more transparent process, and add a third option of referring decisions back to the CRTC while retaining the authority to vary or rescind if necessary.

We are pleased that the minister finally saw the light and agreed. This whole section was improved at committee. With time limits being imposed on cabinet petitions and other ways of creating a more transparent process the option of referring a decision back to the CRTC now exists at least. Hopefully, moral suasion and the process of good government will lead to this option being used in the future as a route of choice.

What more can we say with respect to the fact that the minister and this government wanted the power to license carriers? I am very pleased that the minister saw the error in this approach and removed his licensing regime for carriers. It was rather redundant and bureaucratic and it seems to me totally opposite to everything this minister and government have been saying about smaller government. There was significant opposition to this measure across the industry and across the country. How ironic that a minister who everywhere else in this bill wanted to emphasize market forces was creating a grand new arm of government to license carriers.

• (1645)

Liberals took strong exception to adding another layer of red tape, so that was finally removed. It could have put ministers and Governor in Council in a very embarrassing situation so I am pleased that it is gone.

We believe that we need to do everything we can to foster a strong, dynamic Canadian telecommunications system and we think strong Canadian ownership rules are part of that. I must say that we are very pleased with that aspect of the bill.

We need to make sure that our own people own and manage, that our own people are the workers, that our own researchers and scientists, our own manufacturers and our software and hardware designers all have a chance to prosper and remain at the leading edge of technology.

Global alliances and global markets are part of the reality but let us make sure that there are sufficient safeguards in place so that net benefits to Canada are assured when foreign companies come in here. Those benefits should be a top priority.

In the recent case of Unitel and AT&T I know that we accepted Unitel's promises that Canadian priorities will be met in terms of domestic jobs, research and management. However we do see some signs of high U.S. executives being brought in to replace Canadian ones and of significant software and equipment being brought in from the U.S. An unfortunate undercurrent of concern is out there about how much AT&T is or is not letting Unitel management, Canadian born and bred,

and Canadian competence make strong and independent Canadian decisions.

In terms of the bill, scrutiny will definitely have to be paid to how the 80 per cent domestic ownership requirements work and how the holding company regulations will actually look. In short, we want to make sure the intent of these domestic ownership provisions is valid and that they work in the national interest of Canada.

In terms of the new forbearance power, Liberals were concerned that it work in the public interest. Some serious amendments were made by the government to this key element of the bill and it is a much more workable section now. For Liberals we know the concern out there is to avoid wholesale deregulation through an improperly worded forbearance clause. We believe the commission now has sufficient tools to safeguard the marketplace, protect the consumers and review where needed when this power is used.

Let me echo something the Senate alluded to and something I have been concerned about since the privatization of Telesat. That is the need for the Competition Bureau to have a more explicit role in consulting with the CRTC and giving regular advice when it is needed in the regulation of our telecommunications industry.

Concentration of ownership is a concern. I concur with the Senate suggestion that the role of competition policy should have been addressed either directly by the director of the Competition Bureau or indirectly through a consultative mechanism between the CRTC and the Competition Bureau.

The government refused to move on this proposal, so we are going to have to save that for another day and see how things have worked out at that time.

Let me turn very briefly, somewhat out of sequence but I do this for clarity, to some of the proposed amendments that the minister did not see fit to accept. In the end I thought we still could have had a better bill if we had included a five-year review of this act in the legislation itself, for example.

I know the minister proclaimed that a House committee could do this if it wanted to and the minister is accurate and correct. However my own experience on the committee shows that when things are very busy, and this was a very busy committee, addressing telecommunications is not the first item members wish to undertake. It is complex. It really was not something that they wanted to learn from scratch. I wish the minister had accepted that motion so reviewing and revisiting the legislation would be an obligation not just the choice of a committee.

I also wanted to give all interested parties a reasonable opportunity to be heard under the cabinet power to refer back, to vary and to rescind. I felt that when cabinet, either on petition or on its own motion, wanted to make an order it would be only democratic that people have a chance to be heard first. Again, this was not accepted by the minister.

There are a great many issues that came up in this bill, all of which cannot be addressed here today. I hope this bill works. I hope it is what the industry and the Canadian population need. I hope we will be prepared to make any changes needed if any shortcomings become apparent.

• (1650)

In conclusion let me summarize by going back to the beginning. The government's failure to take telecommunications issues seriously hindered Canadians' progress in this area. It produced a flawed policy process that in the end initially placed a flawed piece of legislation before Parliament. Despite this, Liberals took a very constructive approach and were prepared to move forward on this bill in the interest of Canadians and Canadian business.

Let us be very clear. The minister said yesterday that the opposition was delaying his bill. We believe we improved this bill expeditiously with no unnecessary delays. We were helped by my legislative assistant, Matthew Behan, the industry and the people around the table. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, we have a much better bill.

While the minister seeks praise for finally getting around to a telecommunications bill after nine years, I do not hear much praise out there from the industry or across the country. It took a press conference and lobbying by this industry to get this bill moved to the front burner, get this government and its House leader

out of neutral and move this legislation from the horse and buggy age to more modern legislation and a Canadian industry of worth.

Mieux vaut tard que jamais. Better late than never.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Under Standing Order 74 the first two speakers have 40 minutes. The third speaker has 20 minutes plus 10 minutes questions and comments.

Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (Okanagan—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, I listened intently to the comments made by both the Minister of Communications and my counterpart, the critic on communications for the Liberal Party, the member for Mount Royal.

I want to congratulate the member for Mount Royal for some very cogent comments and take the opportunity to thank her for an outstanding performance as an opposition critic in the debates in committee. I think both opposition parties did everything humanly possible to make this piece of legislation a better piece of legislation. On behalf of my Liberal colleague and, if I may be so bold as to say, also on our behalf I think those efforts paid off. This is certainly a much better piece of legislation than when this bill was first introduced into the House.

I would also like to take the opportunity to congratulate those individuals in the industry as well as the officials from the CRTC who were at the table during the committee hearings. I think their assistance and the expert advice they were able to give us as opposition critics provided us with a greater level of knowledge and understanding than perhaps we could have gained without their presence.

It was certainly a very productive committee. The presence of members from the industry, members from the various consumer groups and various organizations as well as the CRTC provided a great deal of insight in making this a better bill.

Although it is significantly improved I am afraid the bill still has a considerable distance to go to make it the kind of legislation we should have coming into the 21st century. We have to remember that this bill is taking us out of the horse and buggy age of communications from the Railway Act of the early 1900s to the turn of the century. It is a quantum leap in terms of the technological advances that have taken place within that time frame. There is no question that the legislation was very much overdue.

In light of that it was somewhat disconcerting to see the bill introduced after nine years of this government's presence, virtually within the dying moments of this legislative session.

• (1655)

This bill has been in process for some time now under two former communications ministers of this government. It did not see the light of day until it was finally introduced in February of last year. Even then the bill sat on the back burner and was not brought forward except to be referred to the Senate committee on transport for a pre-study in the summer of 1992. In terms of coming to this House, the government allowed it to languish on the back burner until April 19 of this year. That was fully 14 months after the bill was first tabled and almost a year after the Senate committee made recommendations for change.

Even at that stage, after bringing it into the House and with the opportunity the government had to make changes and reintroduce the bill it did not do so. We ended up in committee with a bill of 137 to 139 clauses. The government brought in the first round of about 51 or 52 amendments on its own. It then brought in further amendments to amend the very amendments it had made. It was a very perplexing, confusing and difficult time for all members of the committee. It was exceedingly difficult to ensure that the changes we were making were appropriate changes that would do the job we wanted them to do when the government was bringing in changes on those changes.

The time frame and the number of amendments the government chose to bring in made the process of legislative change little more than a shambles. It does not speak very highly of this minister and his ministry or this government for the way they handled this very important piece of legislation. I can only hope that when this bill becomes law—and it will become law because the government will vote it through at the end of the day—it does the job we hope it will do. My fear is that there are a lot of loose ends that will amount to a loophole that you can drive a Mack truck through. That is of concern to me when we look at the direction this industry is heading.

I listened to the comments made by the minister in introducing the bill. He waxed quite eloquent about the opportunities for global investment under this bill. There are no clauses in this bill that deal with opportunities for global investment. This is a domestic piece of legislation. Canadian telecommunications industries are already

performing on the global stage and doing quite well so I do not know where his argument comes in.

He talks about job creation. The fact is that under the deregulatory structure this bill will introduce, we will very likely see considerable job losses also taking place in the industry. As a result of the CRTC decision to deregulate the long-distance telecommunication market we are seeing a restructuring in our telephone market. That has already amounted to the loss of some 820 full-time positions in British Columbia alone under the restructuring taking place within B.C. Telephone. The minister's comments and flowery eloquence about the job creation that will take place under this bill is suspect to say the least.

He also talks about preventing businesses from moving south by giving them lower long-distance rates. Lowering long-distance telecommunications costs is not going to keep businesses from moving south. Businesses are moving south because American branch plants are closing their Canadian branch plant operations and moving back to their head office operations because now they can import products across the U.S.-Canada border tariff-free. They are moving south because of the free trade agreement, not necessarily because of high long-distance costs, so that argument is a bit of a whitewash.

• (1700)

He also talks about the bill providing services to rural areas. The bill may endanger the services we currently provide to rural and isolated areas throughout Canada. Canadians have been served by a first class telecommunications system put together under a regulatory network that has ensured virtual universal access, no matter where one lives in the country, to the telephone as an instrument of communications. Canada has one of the highest levels of utilization. About 98 per cent of Canadian homes have telephone services.

Because of cross-subsidization and the low cost of servicing for residential connections the services to many homes that currently have access to telecommunications services are in danger. As long distance rates go down under deregulation we see right now in the industry residential rates, particularly the rates for installation in rural areas, going sky high. We have already seen substantial increases requested by B.C. Tel and Bell Canada in Ontario for residential consumers. As long distance rates go down consumer rates are going substantially higher. That will endanger the whole concept of universality in our telecommunications services. We fear that is the weakness in the current legislation.

The minister indicated that the bill was a visionary document providing a consolidated telecommunications policy to take us into the future. Nothing could be further from the truth. The bill is not a visionary document whatsoever. It has completely ignored the vital question of convergence of technologies and of the ability to combine voice communications, digital communications, video and audio through fibre optic networks.

We are dealing with a phenomenon we simply have never experienced before where a single fibre optic cable can carry thousands upon thousands of simultaneous conversations or video signals for television hook-ups. The bill simply has not addressed the whole problem of technological convergences in the industry.

The bill is not a visionary document. The bill is simply an entrenchment of the corporate agenda. It is a way of ensuring profits remain high for our telecommunications companies. It is a way of ensuring that the new entries into the market and the slow encroachment of the U.S. telecommunications industries into the Canadian marketing system are given the opportunity to maximize their profits at the expense, I might add, of residential consumers.

To get back to discussing some elements of the bill, I mentioned the number of amendments the government had brought in. It really was very difficult to see where the government was going with the piece of legislation. To give an example, the government absolutely insisted that ministerial licensing provisions were crucial to the piece of legislation. They had to be in there.

A large section of the bill dealt with ministerial licensing provisions and then the government pulled the whole section. It decided they should not be in there. It changed definitions. It modified the very objectives. No longer was the principal telecommunications policy to be ensuring universal access to affordable telephone services and telecommunications services. It was to serve

the market needs of companies, to ensure they would be able to pursue the process of unfettered competition.

The government first came in with a bill that included a commitment to ensuring the integrity of Canada's cultural industries. It then decided that culture did not really need to be in the bill and took it out. As opposition members, we argued ourselves blue in the face that culture, because of the whole phenomenon of convergence, would be a very important component to maintain in this piece of legislation.

The minister and I must admit his deputy minister were absolutely intransigent in putting back in the bill what they had there in the first place. We could not convince them that culture was important. It is a very critical weakness in the legislation that the minister and his senior advisers decided to appease the powers in the Quebec caucus that did not want culture in there in the first place. They pulled it out and left it out so culture would no longer be deemed important when dealing with telecommunications issues. That is a critical weakness of the bill. We will be sorry that change was made.

• (1705)

The government placed artificial time deadlines on the committee. It was almost impossible for the committee to deal with the substantive changes and the avalanche of amendments made by the government within the time frame it was given.

Groups concerned about the legislation whose input was important were turned away. They were asked to submit briefs to the committee. They should have had an opportunity to discuss it in an appropriate forum, but the committee was up against impossible time constraints.

Opposition parties proposed a large number of amendments. The first set proposed by the New Democratic Party numbered well over 30. In total about 50 amendments were made. I submitted at the time that these amendments were desperately needed to improve the bill. Simply speaking the government left it too late. We did not have time to deal with them appropriately, and the bill goes through with serious flaws in it.

As I mentioned before the bill excludes culture. It is one of the most serious omissions in the bill. Cultural groups across the country are rightly outraged. A commitment to maintaining Canada's cultural identity and ensuring the strength of our cultural fabric has been expunged from the legislation. Multinational businesses are already exploiting telecommunications to circumvent Canadian rules intended to protect and promote Canadian culture.

I will give an example. *Sports Illustrated* is now publishing a Canadian edition with virtually no Canadian content. It does it by beaming in a signal by satellite across the border and printing it in Canada. The federal government's hands are tied and will be tied particularly with the fact that culture is no longer part of our telecommunications policy.

The bill is silent on the issues of culture and convergence, yet right now telephone and cable companies are scrambling to position themselves to provide the integrated services of the 21st century. The bill is silent in that regard. It is a serious failure of the bill. If the bill is passed into law, telecommunications companies will be exempted from the rules that apply to broadcasters to promote culture, but they could very well be offering virtually the same products as broadcasters.

I see my time is very limited. I know I only have half the time of the minister and the Liberal critic, but I would like to make a few more comments in wrapping up.

Because the bill has failed to address the policy of job protection many Canadian jobs have been put at risk. One of the amendments we in the New Democratic Party had tried to include was one to maintain and enhance Canadian jobs in a Canadian owned industry, and the bill remains silent on that.

The concept of affordable and universal telephone access is also at risk. We tried to have put back into the objectives of the bill the concept of providing universal and affordable telephone services. Although it is not entirely silent on it, the failure of the government to agree to strengthen the provision has certainly put the concept of universality at risk.

This piece of legislation is important. We very dearly would have liked to have been able to support it. Many of the amendments we proposed would have gone a long way toward providing a degree of comfort for the New Democratic Party to support the legislation. There is no question that it is needed, but the inherent weaknesses in the current bill prevent us from having that degree of comfort and essentially supporting the bill.

• (1710)

The flaws that are in it must be addressed. As I said before it is a visionless document that tends to if anything entrench the *status quo*.

Other than the fact that it is a document that opens up one very large avenue which is of great concern, and that is the whole process of deregulation, it is a document that essentially harmonizes this with the North American free trade agreement and in the future may put many Canadian jobs at risk.

Mr. Ron MacDonald (Dartmouth): Mr. Speaker, the question that I want to pose to my colleague from the New Democratic Party is one that deals with process since he was a key operative in the committee system. I want to review just a couple of facts and ask him for his comments.

It is very clear from the comments made by my colleague from Mount Royal, who deserves credit from all members of this House and people who are truly interested in this matter for the work that she has done over the years, it was back in 1984 that the then minister responsible, now Minister for International Trade, indicated clearly that it was going to be a priority of this government in its first few days to come in with this type of legislation.

Indeed in 1986 with the then minister at the time, the hon. member for Frontenac, and in 1987 the then minister Flora MacDonald, it seemed every time that there was an opportunity for these ministers of communications to give a speech, to get before a camera, they indicated that this was a top priority piece of legislation or legislative changes that they wished to pursue. Every single time that they got before an appropriate audience they talked about how they would be the minister that would put together a bill with a tremendous degree of consensus to make these necessary changes.

Indeed it was in February 1992, and this is June 1993, that the current minister, who got up and wanted to talk about all the wonderful things that he has done with this bill, introduced this particular bill in Parliament. It was introduced at that time, yet it was 10 months later, April 19, 1993, before this minister could convince his House leader that this bill was important and, as he had said, before he could get it called up for second reading. That is nearly 15 full months.

In the meantime this minister had the Senate pre-study the legislation. The Senate came in with a pile of recommendations about what had to be changed in the bill. It basically said the bill was flawed. There were some major problems with the bill.

We in the opposition at that point felt that this 14 month respite from looking at the bill on the floor of the House of Commons or sending it to committee after second reading was due to the fact that the minister was rewriting the bill. When we got it back here on April 19 we found out that that was not the case at all. It was the same piece of legislation.

We went to committee where we had two weeks of hearings. Time allocation was brought in at second reading of the bill. When we went into committee my understanding is, and the member can tell me if I am correct, that not everybody was heard. The opposition parties said: "Listen, this is an important piece of legislation and we have given you an unusual degree of concurrence in trying to put this forward but these people must be heard". That was not the case. The government used its majority and shut down the committee after two weeks.

On June 1 at report stage, with one and a half hours debate, the minister opposite who wants to pat himself on the back—I listened to him carefully today—accused the opposition of mounting a filibuster. He had almost 15 months to take this bill into the House, lots of House of Commons time, yet he accused us and the members in the New Democratic Party of a filibuster. I would like to see his definition of a filibuster.

What did he do? He then used that as an excuse to and use time allocation again. He had time allocation came into this House for report stage and third reading, meaning one day each.

I want to ask my colleague from the New Democratic Party this. This bill has been long overdue in the making. This bill has 138 clauses. In committee the government

members came in with over 50 motions and those 50 motions represented over 100 amendments. The opposition parties put forward over 50 amendments.

• (1715)

I want to ask my colleague opposite why this minister, who likes to claim that he is so well respected within his caucus, took a year and one-half to proceed with this legislation through the House. Does the hon. member believe it is absolutely despicable that this bill has seen the thirtieth use of time allocation by this government in this Parliament in addition to closure 15 times? It has been used 45 times to shotgun legislation through the House.

Mr. MacWilliam: Mr. Speaker, my colleague from the Liberal Party has raised some very legitimate concerns.

This whole process of introducing this bill and then letting it languish on the Order Paper for the extended period of time that it did and bringing it forward in the dying hours of this session of this tired old Tory government has been nothing less than a disaster.

As the hon. member said it forced the committee into time restraints and constrictions which was all part of the game plan. The Tories do not want any democratic debate. They do not want to hear the opinions of the people across Canada in terms of their concerns over this legislation. They wanted to ram it through committee and ram it through the subcommittee dealing with it at report stage.

As the hon. member has said it was the government in the first whack that brought in over 50 amendments to a bill of 139 clauses. The government wanted to change 50 of them. By the time we got finished there was amendment upon amendment. The process was a shambles and the minister should be ashamed of himself for allowing that kind of process to take place.

If it had not been for the hard work of the opposition critics ensuring that each of those clauses was thoroughly debated and discussed and bringing to the table representation from the CRTC, the industry and interested organizations, and demanding they be heard because of the quantity of changes that had to be made, what else would have snuck through and weakened the legislation even further?

It is an absolute travesty that this government pulls this kind of subterfuge and then when it gets it into the House after one hour and a half of debate at report stage of this bill this minister has the unmitigated gall to say that we are filibustering.

This minister knows full well that this House can no longer filibuster because the government has all the tools at its disposal to pull the plug at any time. All he was trying to do was obfuscate the process and say the opposition was filibustering just to make life difficult for the government and for the industry.

We cannot filibuster. The government has all the tools and it used those tools just the other day. The minister after one hour and a half of debate at report stage pulled the pin and brought in time allocation. As the member has said it is the thirtieth time this government has done this.

This government has used closure and time allocation more in this parliamentary session than in all the rest of the history of Parliament and Canada. It is an absolute abuse of the privilege of Parliament and this government has used it to the hilt.

I say it is a travesty to the democratic process that once again this minister through the government has used this procedure to shut down the type of democratic debate that should have taken place with this bill, that could have taken place with this bill but what he did not want to see take place.

Mr. John Harvard (Winnipeg—St. James): Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to pay tribute to my colleague from Mount Royal because her work on Bill C-62 has been immense. She has always offered a critical and positive eye and I think because of her hard work this bill has been improved. In many ways I wish I could say the same about the government. For nine long years the government dithered on telecommunications. It talked a lot but it always procrastinated. I just remind you, Mr. Speaker, of a quote made by the then finance minister back in 1984. He said: "There is a clear need for a national telecommunications policy to take advantage of the opportunities presented by rapidly advancing technology and the growing demand by Canadians for new telecommunication services. Through regulatory reform the government can spur innovation and provide a major stimulus to the Canadian economy".

• (1720)

That was in 1984. Despite all the talk about the need to move fast, we saw the very opposite from the government. Bill C-62 was introduced well over a year ago. Second reading and committee examination did not

come until this spring. Now, as we approach the end of this Parliament, the government says there is no time to waste, it is time to rush, rush, rush. The government even had the gall to bring in time allocation, a form of closure. The whole thing is rather sickening. For nine long years the government did nothing and yet we were forced to proceed with all haste even if it meant stifling parliamentary debate.

I do not think I have to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that telecommunications is one of the most important industries in Canada. Here are some facts to back that up. It employs more than 100,000 Canadians. It generates over $20 billion in revenue. It invests heavily each year in Canadian research and development, in new technologies and in new plant and equipment. As my esteemed critic from Mount Royal said, and I quote: "All of this is made possible by tapping the resources of highly skilled, highly trained Canadians".

I want to further quote my colleague from Mount Royal because of what she says about the role of telecommunications in Canada. Again I quote: "Telecommunications is also an important strategic industry for our entire economy, helping other industries to compete by giving them access to the information and communication revolution. This, of course, helps us create the knowledge intensive, high technology jobs of the future, and helps them where our people are outside traditional business centres, particularly in our regions. But this highly regulated industry requires appropriate policy, legislative and regulatory environment in which to succeed".

In looking at the bill itself, one of its major intentions is to introduce competition in what has traditionally been a monopolistic industry. The degree of competition, however, is open to some question, and only time will tell how well the competition develops. We hope it develops very well. Its other intentions are to adopt the principles of affordable universally accessible telephone service, give the federal government clear authority over what has been a fragmented Canadian market, make the CRTC the regulator for all the 10 provinces, provide the CRTC with more policy direction. The commission may even back away from using its regulatory powers in areas where competitive markets are working and impose a 20 per cent ceiling on foreign ownership of telecommunication companies. The bill is also tackling the problem of telephone nuisance calls.

As you can see, Mr. Speaker, this bill is wide in scope. We support it in principle. Canada needs harmonized rules for telecommunications. In the wake of the information revolution, split jurisdictions for control and regulation do not make a lot of sense any longer.

We on this side of the House do not think the issue of hybrid carriers was adequately addressed in examining the bill. This matter may have to be examined by the new Parliament.

The government has assured us that Bill C–62 respects Canada's cultural interests. Let us indeed hope so. There are some questions in that regard. There is concern that some areas of cultural activity will be missed by the Broadcasting Act and the Telecommunications Act. There should be, in our opinion, no gap with respect to culture.

• (1725)

We will also be watching the 80 per cent domestic ownership requirement. It must work because we need to make sure, as my colleague for Mount Royal has said, our people, our workers, our researchers and scientists, our own manufacturers, software and hardware designers have a chance to prosper and remain on the leading edge of technology.

We are also concerned about the concentration of ownership but the government has refused to address this issue so it may have to be revisited at a later date. Given some of these concerns, we find it rather strange that the government did not agree to a five–year review of this bill being put in the legislation itself. That made sense but the government said no. It has been done before. It was done in reviewing the sexual abuse provisions of the Criminal Code and earlier in Parliament there was a five–year review of the Canadian Security and Intelligence Service Act. There is precedent and yet the government refused to listen.

Moreover the left hand of the government does not seem to know what the right hand is doing. In the area of agriculture where I have some responsibility, the minister has offered a six–year review of continental barley marketing. Producers do not want continental barley marketing at all but the minister is rushing ahead over the protests of producers and offering a six–year review. But when it comes to this particular bill, Bill C–62, there will be no review. In our opinion, not only is this

government old and tired, we think it is confused and very mixed up.

In my final remarks, I would just like to say that we hope that Bill C–62 will work beyond its expectations. If it does fail in some respects it may well be because of the unseemly rush by this government, a rush that really was not necessary at all. If only the government had not dithered and dragged its feet for nine long years.

Mr. Jim Karpoff (Surrey North): Mr. Speaker, I am very much concerned about some aspects of this bill. I understand that the Liberals will be supporting the government.

I am concerned when I look at the documentation and the work done by the TWU in British Columbia and some of the other people in the industry. They have expressed disquiet, particularly about the deregulation component and the entering into the long distance market of competitors which is now being allowed.

The telephone companies are in a position to have to ask for local rate increases to offset the loss of revenue from long distance. There is a growing concern in British Columbia. Yes, 400 jobs may be developed in Kamloops but already 820 jobs have been lost in B.C. Tel.

I would like the member to comment. Does he think that is good mathematics in job creation when you do something that creates 400 jobs and loses 800? I wonder if he has had an opportunity to read some of the material that was prepared by the unions, particularly the TWU, and some of the material prepared by B.C. Tel.

Mr. Harvard: Mr. Speaker, I am not too sure whether this government knows anything about arithmetic. I am absolutely sure that it knows nothing about job creation. It has been telling us for nine long years that it had the answers for our economy. We have waited nine long years and what do we see?

We see rising unemployment. When this government came to power almost nine years ago, the unemployment level was not anywhere near where it is today. Yet today, we have an unemployment rate of about 11.4 per cent which in terms of persons, men and women, amounts to well over 1.5 million Canadians.

When the hon. member for British Columbia asks about job creation, this government does not have a policy with respect to job creation. Its preoccupation, as we know and as it is proud to say over and over again, is to fight inflation. It did a pretty good job of that, but during the process of killing inflation or reducing it to 1 per cent or 2 per cent, it pretty well killed the economy. We have seen unemployment rising at unacceptable levels.

• (1730)

I want to say one other thing. The member from British Columbia is right in expressing those concerns, especially about job creation. It is one more reason why there should have been a clause in this legislation to have a five-year review so we could examine the productivity of this bill five years hence.

Mr. Joe Fontana (London East): Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the debate on third reading of Bill C–62.

Back in 1984 a call went out to a new government that had promised so much to this country. It took nine years for it to answer the call. This bill is about telecommunications—communicating with one another.

It has taken, as some of my colleagues have mentioned, nine long years to have a new telecommunications bill. I am sure we all would agree that telecommunications, advancing as quickly as it does, has made waiting nine years to put your house in order unfair to the consumers, to the industry and all the stakeholders in this great industry. Until two or three years ago, fax machines, cellular telephones and the new innovations have come forward in terms of interactive telecommunications and will soon come to our homes.

I want to talk about two things. I want to congratulate our critic, the member for Mount Royal, who has done an absolutely stalwart job for us during the committee hearings, at second reading stage and even before that. She has been very involved in the telecommunications debate and has asked this government on numerous occasions since 1984 to get on with getting this country

up to the 21st century in telecommunications. I want to applaud her great effort and her hard work.

Having participated somewhat in the committee hearings myself I want to congratulate all the stakeholders who were at the table trying to help in their own way the country to have a modern telecommunications industry. I also want to congratulate the member for Okanagan—Shuswap for his fine effort and that of his party in trying to improve the bill.

I will also congratulate the government for finally bringing forward a bill. The process—and a lot of people have alluded to the process—that this government has put us through is really repugnant and unacceptable. The purpose of Parliament and elected representation is to give Canadians a clear opportunity and chance to hear all sides of the issue so that they can make informed decisions whether or not this bill is a good one or a bad one.

I applaud the efforts of the government finally getting a telecommunications bill in before the next election which is only two or three months away, maybe even sooner depending on who wins the convention this weekend. However it is the process, and this is typical of what this government has done at least since I have been here in 1988, it believes that this place is irrelevant. The government uses closure too often and I think it is repugnant. People should not be expected to have to suffer this kind of abuse from a democratically-elected government.

Telecommunications is really the electronic highway of a country. In our homes and businesses it touches everyone's life because we cannot communicate with one another without answering that telephone or without receiving a signal or without a fax machine. Everything we do in life needs communication. Therefore this telecommunications bill is very important to the lifeblood of a country, not only because it is an important industry that employs 100,000 people, but it brings an awful lot of revenue to this country directly and indirectly through our trade. It is one of the things at which we excel. We are able to export telecommunications. It is an important industry throughout the country.

• (1735)

More important, other businesses cannot operate effectively and competitively without the telecommunications industry or policy that allows each and every one of those businesses to employ a lot more people, create wealth and entrepreneurship. They could not exist without a dynamic telecommunications framework. I think Bill C-62 does that.

We also have to remember that Canada has to compete in the world. I know this government likes to speak often about competitiveness and other matters that are very important for exports. If we are to become truly competitive so that we can compete in a very mean world out there where everybody is trying to achieve the same standard of living as we have, then we have to make sure we are at the forefront of telecommunications.

While this bill is not perfect, admittedly so because some amendments have been put forward by our side and those of the NDP, the fact is that we are not prepared to throw it out, start from scratch and wait another nine years, another four years, another year or what have you. That is why the Liberal Party will be supporting Bill C-62 enthusiastically, even though we have some reservations. It could have been improved upon a lot more. Perhaps our commitment will be that when we form the next government in the next number of months, we will not wait nine years in order to bring in the improvements.

What is important is that Bill C-62, the telecommunications bill, must essentially balance competing interests. The competing interests of the industry would be the public interest, the public which is served by telecommunications. This bill tries to balance competition with the regulatory authority that is necessary to ensure there is a good, managed telecommunications industry.

That is why we put forward some positive amendments that have made the decision-making through Order in Council more transparent, more even, more fair, and has taken some powers away from the minister and essentially put them in the hands of the CRTC. That body can review and look at these substantive issues that will come up because telecommunications is changing each and every day.

We have asked that it be mandatory to have a sunset clause or a review clause. I know the minister responded to my question a number of days ago when he said that a committee could review any bill at any time. It is a commitment that would have been very positive.

We could have said that in five years, four years—we proposed five—that it be mandatory for Parliament to review our telecommunications bill to ensure we do not cause what happened the last time, a wait at least nine years for the changes to be made.

Industry, telecommunications industry, other businesses, people, require that the government lead and not follow in these areas. That is what has happened and that is where we failed as a Parliament and as a government. We have followed and not lead in the telecommunications forefront.

It is important that in this recessionary time—I do not think we have come out of the recession—we look for tremendous opportunities for this country. One of the things that telecommunications bring to this country is high technology and skilled workers. It is an industry that has unlimited potential growth. Canada ought to make as its objective to become the best in the world in telecommunications. We have that infrastructure already.

• (1740)

With the support of the government and the stakeholders and with everyone working together co-operatively we can make this the best industry for Canada so that we can export the technology and expertise we have and not only build a great telecommunications industry domestically but one for other countries of the world.

Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, I listened to my friend with a great deal of interest. I listened earlier to my friend from Okanagan—Shuswap with similar interest as he made a very circular argument. It was essentially that because the government now has the ability to time allocate and put an end through time allocation to a filibuster that a filibuster is impossible and therefore it is unnecessary to use time allocation. It is an intriguing argument but is not one that holds up to very close scrutiny.

I listened with great interest to my friend from London when he referred to the use of time allocation as something that is repugnant. He said that at least twice. We see speaker after speaker on the opposition side denying that they would ever dream of anything like a filibuster and saying how shocked they are that the government would put an end to their attempts to have an interminable debate.

I have a very simple question for my friend. Is he aware of this statement that was made by his colleague from Mount Royal, the Liberal critic, as recorded in the committee transcript from May 27, 1993? The transcript reads: "Mrs. Finestone: If you pull culture out I forewarn you that you will have a filibuster in this House that you will not believe and that you will not get this bill without calling closure again and demonstrating once again what an undemocratic government you are".

Is my friend aware of that statement? Does he believe that the member for Mount Royal was telling the truth when she said that? Does he deny that it was the intention of the Liberal Party to act on this commitment and filibuster this piece of legislation?

Mr. Fontana: Mr. Speaker, the member for Mount Royal always tells the truth.

I do not know why this minister displays this kind of arrogance or elitism. I know that he is supporting one of the candidates who displays that kind of characteristic. I do not know if it is rubbing off on every one of these ministers.

We are all here to serve our country. We are all here to do exactly the same thing, to try to do the best job we possibly can. I was part of that committee. I want to applaud the chairman of that committee who happens to be a member of the minister's party. At least he respected the people around and it did not matter what party they were a member of. We were all trying to do the best job we could.

The question is not whether we were prepared to or whether we threatened to filibuster. The fact remains that this minister only brought this bill at second reading in April of this year. At second reading he gave us two days to discuss the principle of the bill.

When the bill went into committee it was the minister's own department that introduced 150 amendments. Talk about a filibuster. Why did the minister not do his work right in the first place? The minister took more time with his amendments than the committee and this Parliament took in debating the whole issue.

This has absolutely nothing to do with a filibuster. It is the incompetence of this government that is the issue.

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona): Mr. Speaker, we must have come a long way in order for anybody in their right mind to regard this as a filibuster. This is hardly a filibuster. The minister, as someone who spent many years in opposition before his last nine years in government, participated in many a long debate that was far more qualified to be described as a filibuster than what we have today.

I wonder what the Minister of Communications called those 16 days of bell ringing. Yet he has the nerve, on an afternoon when we are considering third reading of a major restructuring of the telecommunications industry in this country, to get up and accuse anyone of filibustering.

• (1745)

It may be that the Liberal critic threatened to filibuster. However it is obvious that it was an empty threat because this is not a filibuster. No one here this afternoon claims to be engaging in a filibuster but simply in an attempt to outline our concerns about this bill.

The ongoing conversation across the floor of the House of Commons between the Liberals and Conservatives is evidence of something that is worth pointing out when it comes to this bill, and that is, the Official Opposition intends to vote with the government on the bill.

The minister is perfectly able to get up and leave the House if he does not like what I am saying. Once again we see evidence of the real confluence of ideas and interests between the Liberals and Conservatives when it comes to major issues on the corporate agenda.

This bill concerns deregulation. The Liberals are saying that it is not exactly what they want but they are going to vote for it anyway, even though the objection they threatened to filibuster around in committee still stands. That is their objection with respect to the removal by the government of culture as an element of this bill.

When push comes to shove there is not that much fight over there when it comes to this kind of thing because basically they are of the same mind. It was the Liberal Party that began the deregulation of the transportation industry in 1984 when the current member for Winnipeg South Centre was the Minister of Transport.

We heard the same kind of facile optimism then about the benefits of deregulation and how we had to bring our transportation system into the 21st century. We heard how we could not resist the modern trends and that we had to be with it.

We have been with it now in the transportation industry for nine years. It was not long after the Liberals started deregulating the transportation system that the Conservatives came into power and carried forward the same corporate agenda on behalf of the same people who had been asking the Liberals to do the very same thing.

Now we see history repeating itself. The member for Winnipeg—St. James was up there saying: "We hope the competition goes well. We hope this happens. We hope that happens". In this case there is no willingness to learn from history. They might have had an excuse in 1984, although they could have looked at what happened in the United States and drawn some lessons from there.

Now they at least have the Canadian experience in deregulation of transportation to look at. There is still no real learning on the part of the Liberal Party when it comes to deregulation. Deregulation will not serve Canadian industry, interests or culture or the integrity of the country very well at all. I feel I should be mystified by the position of the Liberal Party on this bill but I am not.

It points out something that has happened time and time again in this House. Most recently it happened on Bill C-106, an energy bill that eliminated the last vestiges of the National Energy Program. Those vestiges concerned the requirement for Canadian ownership in petroleum development on the Canada Lands.

In the same week the hon. Leader of the Official Opposition spoke about how he felt about the North American free trade agreement and what a shame it was that Mexico had struck a much harder and more independent deal with respect to its energy resources with the United States than Canada had done with NAFTA. He talked about how it would be the goal of the Liberal

Party if it was in government to reclaim energy sovereignty for Canada.

• (1750)

In that same week, within 48 hours of that speech, the Liberal caucus rose *en masse* in the House of Commons and voted with the government to eliminate the Canadian ownership requirement for the Canada Lands. Why was the government in a hurry to do this? It is because it is all part of the same agenda. In this case it is part of the North American free trade agreement agenda. That is what Bill C–106 was about because there actually was a provision in the North American free trade agreement that would have protected the particular provision that Bill C–106 eliminated but only if it existed at the time of the implementation of the agreement.

There was an opportunity there to protect Canadian energy sovereignty that was removed by the government with the collaboration of the Liberal Party in the same week that we had to suffer through speeches by the Leader of the Official Opposition about how the Liberals were so very interested in reclaiming energy sovereignty for Canada in whatever talks they might have with the Americans after they form the government in the fall of this year, or so they hope.

What is happening today is all part of that same package. It is the nervy and quiet, and they do not make a big deal out of it, collaboration between the Liberals and the Conservatives when it comes to matters pertaining to the corporate agenda of deregulation, privatization and free trade. That is what is before us in this bill.

In the early eighties, when there was concern about deregulation of the telecommunications industry, the minister of communications for the Manitoba government at that time came down here and met with members of Parliament from Manitoba, of all political stripes. He expressed concern to them about the effect of deregulation on the ability of publicly owned utilities like the Manitoba Telephone System to provide affordable phone service to Manitobans.

Although affordable phone service is listed in this particular legislation as one of the goals of the bill there are no measures to guarantee that affordable service will be maintained. We all know that the end result of deregulation, and this is the legislative complement to what the CRTC has already made possible in terms of telephone competition, despite all the denials and arguments to the contrary will be that the relatively cheap phone service that ordinary Canadians have enjoyed for a long time will eventually disappear.

The ability of public utilities like the Manitoba Telephone System or other telephone companies to cross–subsidize and make possible the kind of affordable phone service that so many people have enjoyed will eventually be destroyed by the kind of competition that we are now seeing in the long distance telephone industry and in telecommunications generally.

It is a question of jobs and sovereignty and it is a question of whether we want to be part and parcel of this over–all agenda that I am sure the minister knows only too well. We are not for it. The minister says he is. He has his own reasons which are internally coherent, ideologically speaking. Our reasons for not supporting this kind of agenda are also internally coherent, ideologically speaking.

It bothers me that there are two different approaches coming out of the same political party. We constantly get rhetoric from the Liberal Party on this issue with respect to culture, sovereignty and independence. When push comes to shove it means eliminating the last vestiges of requirements for Canadian ownership of Canada Lands, voting with the government on deregulation of the telecommunications industry and being the party that actually started deregulation of the transportation industry in the first place.

• (1755)

These are the kinds of things Canadians should be aware of if they want to register their objection to these policies in the next election. They should be clear about just where everybody stands.

The matter of jobs is one of the big issues here because there are upwards of 100,000 jobs in Canada involved in this industry. These jobs are the backbone of many Canadian communities. In B.C. alone 820 jobs have just been lost. B.C. Tel said that these job losses are the direct result of deregulation and competition.

We see this so often. We see the industries themselves saying that the job losses in their particular sector are the result of deregulation. These companies are often quoted by the government as sources of reliable information and yet when they attribute job losses in their industry to deregulation, free trade or whatever the case

may be, these analyses are not taken seriously by the government.

Many times CN, for instance, has attributed what is happening in the rail sector in terms of job losses and down-sizing or rationalization, to free trade and deregulation. This is not something we are simply manufacturing out of nothing and attributing to these agreements because we do not like them. This is something the industries that are involved in this and know the ins and outs of their particular industries are saying about deregulation. B.C. Tel has said that these 820 job losses are the direct result of deregulation and competition.

Canadians will have an opportunity when the election is called to say whether or not they like this brave new world of deregulation in telecommunications, transportation or free trade. They will have an opportunity to say whether they want to continue with that or whether they want to choose an alternative.

God help them if they are trying to sort out where the Liberal Party stands on this. They will not be able to make sense of what Liberals say, do or how they vote in the House of Commons because they have been very inconsistent lately. They talked about energy sovereignty and yet voted against Canadian ownership in the Canada Lands. They talked against the government agenda in general and yet refused to see that deregulation is part and parcel of the whole corporate agenda that this government has been advancing.

Maybe I am wrong to say they refuse to see it. Maybe they do see it. I believe that when it comes to the corporate agenda there is very little difference between the Liberals and the Conservatives. There may be some other policy differences. They are not identical twins but they are certainly fraternal twins and when it comes to things like deregulation there is very little difference indeed.

Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (Okanagan—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a few comments directed to my colleague regarding the particular arguments he has just made.

As the critic for the New Democrats in the telecommunications area and one who saw this bill through its passage, it is somewhat confusing to see the level of criticism that was levelled at the legislation from our Liberal colleagues when I just found out a short while ago that they will be supporting the legislation.

• (1800)

I do not know how they can have their cake and eat it too. The opposition critic during committee stage and other members in the House today have been so critical of the various components of the legislation, yet when push comes to shove they say they do not like it but are going to vote for it.

We have taken the position that we do not like the bill. There are many weaknesses in the bill and we feel that although it will pass because the government has the majority it is a matter of principle. The bill is fundamentally flawed and we should oppose that legislation for the record and fight for stronger legislation in the future.

My colleague was talking about the whole problem of deregulation. The major thrust of this bill is to drive forward the deregulatory process. We have seen Unitel apply for application to the long-distance market. The CRTC has passed that and is now skimming the cream off the profitable long-distance market. As a result of that the cost of long-distance telephone calls has dropped substantially.

Traditionally the profits from long-distance telephone calls would be used to offset the high cost of local services and keep those costs low so all Canadians had access to those services. Mr. Ronald Lipert, a spokesman for AGT, the Alberta Government Telephone, said in February of this year that long-distance rates have decreased by 40 per cent and increases in local rates are the other side of it. As long-distance rates come down, local rates can only go up.

I want to ask my colleague, when local rates go up does that not endanger the very principle of universality and affordable access that has been held dear in terms of our past telecommunications policy?

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, I would submit to my hon. friend that it does endanger the principle of universality and affordable access and this is the case in so many other areas as well.

In Canada we have had a practice which has been systematically destroyed and the telecommunications industry is one of the last areas in which this principle is to be destroyed. Cross-subsidization within industry and using the profits for instance that are made in some transportation corridors to subsidize other transportation corridors that are not as fruitful or profitable has gone by the board. It is also going by the board here in telecommunications.

Eventually this, user pay the full cost, kind of thinking will end up destroying the country because the principle of equalization which is in our Constitution is part of the same philosophy. We do not simply say to Manitoba, Saskatchewan or P.E.I. that they are on their own. We use the wealth that is created in more wealthy areas of the country to make a certain standard of living available for everyone.

It is the same principle when it comes to telephones. We would take the money we made in long-distance telephone calls to make it possible for everyone including the pensioner on a meagre fixed income to have inexpensive phone service. That is not going to happen.

Two separate reports have indicated that charges for local calls have increased world-wide when governments have attempted to reduce long-distance rates through competition. According to the Brussels-based European consumers organization the gap in the cost of service is widening between small and large users in most nations. This report released in early 1992 said that Canada was one of the most successful models of competition, that is to say before this bill. It is important to note this was completed before the CRTC announced its decision to deregulate the long distance market before the bill was passed.

• (1805)

In other words we used to do things right in the country. There were a lot of things we used to do right in the country. I do not understand the ideological obsession of the government, helped at times by the Liberals, to destroy the way we used to do things. It worked well.

What was the problem? The problem was that people were excluded from the system who wanted to get in there and make money. That was the problem. The Unitels of this world did not like the fact there was a working system and they could not get their hands on any of the money.

We have restructured the whole country so that these people could get a piece of the action. While they get a piece of the action the average Canadian who used to be served well by a regulated transportation industry, a regulated telecommunications industry, a mixed economy, Crown corporations and all other things that used to work right in the country, is not being served well at all. That particular kind of Canada has been systematically dismantled by the government.

Mr. Ron MacDonald (Dartmouth): Mr. Speaker, I listened attentively and it is unfortunate the member got into so much faulty rhetoric. Much of what he says concerning some of the flaws in the bill is correct. If he had taken the time to read minutes of the hearings of the committee in their entirety, or even appear at some of the committees, he would know the motions put forward by the Liberal Party and by the New Democratic Party were in an interest not of getting everything we want or we would take our marbles and go home, but in trying to have a palatable bill go through the House after nine years of promises by the government.

Some of the work done by his party's critic, and most important the work done by the member for Mount Royal, was instrumental in correcting this far too late, tardy, death-bed legislation. It had some flaws that were inherent in the original piece of legislation, flaws that were seen by the Senate, the other place, when it studied it.

I do not live in a world of rose coloured glasses. I understand after five years in this place that the bunch opposite because they had the numbers would force through the most unpalatable legislation without blinking an eye.

As reasonable individuals sitting in the opposition we fight like hell and we get as much good put in bills as we can. We do not always say that unless we get everything we are going to go home, which is what the hon. member seems to be saying. His party and his colleague did incredibly good work on the bill.

I want to ask a question of the member. He made a lot of references to some type of collusion between the Liberal Party and the tired old Tories opposite on free

trade and other legislation. His rhetoric was far too dangerous today.

When he gets up in the House is it possible that for once he could speak to some of the good things that happen with all three parties? Is it possible for once to acknowledge people like the member for Mount Royal who is an expert on communications and culture in the House? She has probably forgotten more about communications and culture than I will ever know or he or most members of the House.

When he speaks on a bill as important as this one, is it not possible for him to keep to the issue and to talk about some of the positive things that have been done by members on the Liberal side and indeed his own critic instead of getting away with reckless abandon on the rhetoric he foisted upon the House?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Fee): Could I ask the hon. member for Winnipeg Transcona to please be brief? We have one minute and a half left in the time allocated.

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, it is not a question of going home. I have not asked the Liberals to go home. I have asked why they are not voting against the bill.

They vote against all kinds of things here. They vote against almost everything routinely. I have pointed out that there is a strange coincidence between the government's corporate agenda with respect to deregulation and NAFTA and the times they choose to vote with the government. That is what I tried to point out.

Many times we have worked in committee. I acknowledge the good work done by the hon. member for Mount Royal and by my own colleague, the member for Okanagan—Shuswap. We cannot make a bad idea good with good legislation. I am suggesting the whole notion of deregulation in this case is unacceptable to us. That is why we vote against it. That is why the Liberals vote for it. In the final analysis they are of the same mind as the government when it comes to things like deregulation. That is the point I was trying to make.

• (1810)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Fee): Questions and comments have elapsed. On debate, the hon. member for Broadview—Greenwood.

Mr. Dennis Mills (Broadview—Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I want to begin my remarks by saying to the member of the New Democratic Party that all afternoon our colleague from Mount Royal was pointing out the flaws in the particular piece of legislation. I wanted to repeat that because in his remarks he suggested somehow we were co-operating with the government.

We are not co-operating with the government. We would co-operate with the government if we felt it was doing something constructive, but my colleague from Mount Royal was very specific about the major flaws in this piece of legislation.

At the same time a very important Canadian industry with world class technology is crying out for some rationalization or some modernization in terms of legislation. We are trying to make the best out of a bad situation. Because we are doing that, I do not want him to leave in the minds of Canadians that Liberals have abandoned our traditional principles.

We are a party that has stated in the House for many years that we believe in a strong national government and national programs. It is with national programs that we create national will.

In the last campaign I ran for a very specific reason. I opposed the Meech Lake accord. I could see the Prime Minister's agenda of breaking down or dismantling national institutions, national programs that were galvanizing and holding the country together, programs whereby stronger regions of the country were able to help disadvantaged regions, programs whereby profits for services in stronger urban areas could be used to make sure rural areas or disadvantaged areas could get the same service from coast to coast, region to region.

As Liberals we believe in the point the member of the New Democratic Party made about there being sufficient regulation in the legislation to ensure standard access and affordability across the country. We will continue to fight for it.

I can think of some of the damage the government has foisted upon the Canadian people. I remember in my own city what the government did to the Pearson International Airport, the most profitable airport in North America. In 1984 that airport with terminals 1 and 2 generated a profit before depreciation of close to $140 million. The profit made by the Crown on that airport

was used to look after disadvantaged airports or smaller airports in remote regions of the country.

What has the government done now? It has privatized it. It has basically given that profit centre to the corporate agenda, the private sector. Now in order to maintain our smaller regional airports we have to come up with taxpayers' funds. We can no longer use the profit from Pearson International because it has been privatized. Therefore we have to go to the taxpayer. That is one reason this government has exacerbated the tax burden of Canadians.

• (1815)

In the face of deficit and debt reduction the government chopped the country into many different spirits and pieces. This is why this whole institution is not functioning right now. It has weakened the national government to a point where it no longer has the strength in times of economic crisis to unfold a solid national program. It is frustrated by the provinces because it has turned the provinces into stronger units than the national government.

This piece of legislation is important. This is an industry in which we hold a tremendous edge in terms of talent and technology. There is no way we can walk away from doing our best to support the expertise of the industry. It employs over 100,000 people. It is a $20 billion industry. We have to make the best of it.

The bottom line is that three to four months from now the actions, the agenda and the policies of the government will be put to the Canadian people. It is going to be held accountable for all those policies. Do people want a national government that has basically been dismantled? It has been penny-wise and pound-foolish on all kinds of services. Turning to the notion of contracting out, there used to be a situation where government provided all kinds of—

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I thought the member was in the last few seconds if not minutes of a question and comment. I was asked to be brief in my previous response. The member has now gone on for almost the entire length of a question and comment period. Is he in debate or is he on a question and comment?

When you recognized the member, Mr. Speaker, you recognized him on a brief comment and question. I have been waiting to answer.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Fee): In response to the member's point of order, following the response he made to a previous question I called for debate.

The member is now participating in debate. This is not question or comment.

Mr. Mills: Mr. Speaker, I was actually trying to pick up on some of the points the member made in his remarks that I thought were actually quite constructive. I reassure him that the Liberal Party has not abandoned its traditional approach to making sure that we have a strong national government.

With a strong national government we are in a position to develop policy and ideas. When the conditions are such that the national government must step in to make sure people get back to work it then has the instruments in place to do it. It should not have to go cap in hand or begging to provinces to co-operate on every little piece of law or legislation developed in the House.

When we face the people in the next three to four months I am confident they will vote back the party, the team, that will stand and say we must have a strong national government. That is the only way we can attend to some of the things the member from the New Democratic Party talked about in this particular telecommunications bill.

My colleague from Mount Royal covered all pertinent aspects of the bill that were deficient. She brought forward many constructive amendments. Obviously all of them were not accepted. The point is that in opposition with this government we are lucky to get any kind of amendment at all. As most people in the country now know, when the government decides the way it is going to be, the whole notion of debate or exchange or making a piece of legislation better is something foreign to most of the thought processes on the other side of the House.

• (1820)

I found it really interesting when I listened to the minister earlier. I have known this minister for many years and I have a lot of respect for him. As I was listening to his remarks he talked about a strong national telecommunications policy. I noticed the emphasis on the words "a national" telecommunications policy.

I am sure when he reflects back on these nine years in government he will see that the general trend, the pattern, the approach has been just the exact opposite. This has not been a government of strong national programs. This has been a government of dismantling national programs and selling off Crown corporations, many of which could have been used to good public policy objectives in terms of keeping people working.

The government always uses the excuse of the deficit and the debt but many Canadians will find as we review some of the things that it has dismantled that in fact it has been a greater cost to the national treasury by the fact that it has dismantled them.

This is one of the last weeks in this Parliament. My colleague from the town of Mount Royal, our critic for culture and communications, has stated clearly and emphatically that if we are given the trust in the fall to govern this country then the necessary amendments to this legislation will be dealt with.

Mr. Ron MacDonald (Dartmouth): Mr. Speaker, I made some brief comments earlier but I am compelled to speak again concerning this bill.

First I want to commend the Liberal critic for culture and communication, the member for Mount Royal. If we could strip down some of the partisanship in the House I do not think that we would have many people, on all sides of the House including the government side, who would not agree that the member for Mount Royal is one of the most diligent and hard-working members in this Chamber.

Indeed, the zeal with which she approaches her work lends herself to an unusual degree of consensus from members all over this place about the level of contribution that she makes to the debate, to the policy process and to the committee work in this place.

When we came in here today we talked a lot. She stood up and gave her speech in response to the minister who almost broke both elbows patting himself on the back during his speech at this reading. I thought that the member for Mount Royal did an extremely good job of explaining what was good about this bill. She also talked about the things that were missing from this bill. She talked about process.

I would like to talk about process for a little longer. One of the things that the member has clearly done and something that the New Democrats opposite could learn from is that she understands that the policy process in this place here is a game of give and take. Clearly we do not like everything down to the final word that is in the bill. Clearly there are things that we argued should be in the bill but are not.

However, because we in our party take our jobs seriously, we understand that not everything is a vote in favour of the government or its legislation or against it. We are supporting this legislation as my colleague from Broadview—Greenwood just said because we support the industry. It is clearly necessary, after nine solid years of dithering by a whole host of ministers, all of whom were full of vim and vigour to identify the regulatory problems and the need to come in with comprehensive legislation to streamline it, but none of them seemed to have the political clout I guess to pilot it through the House.

• (1825)

Yes, we are supporting this bill but with a lot of qualifications. Yes, we are saying that we support the industry. We commend the minister albeit somewhat qualified for his late arrival on the scene to fix the regulatory environment. He should have done it a lot sooner.

There are things that should be in this bill that are not. Clearly it would be our hope that after the next election with a Liberal government on that side those things will be addressed. The Minister of the Environment knows that.

Mrs. Browes: You're dreaming.

Mr. MacDonald (Dartmouth): We dare to dream on this side. We do not snuff out those flickers of ingenuity which all too often happens on the other side. I have even seen the minister's flicker of ingenuity be lessened in its brightness and brilliance lately.

I want to talk about the process on this bill. The minister opposite, for whom I have deep respect as a colleague, has been here a long time. Surely to goodness something happened on the way to the store with the minister.

In in 1992 he indicated clearly that it was his priority to fix the regulatory regime and to bring in a piece of legislation. After the fullness of debate and committee hearings and allowing all interested parties to have an input, hopefully we would have come up with a bill that was supportable not just by the Tories who have a

majority or just by the Liberals but by all parliamentarians in this House.

Something happened on the way to the races with this minister. I could not quite figure it out. In 1992 he bought this bill in with a great deal of urgency and fanfare. He probably did a good speech and a good press conference on the whole issue and got a lot of people in the industry excited.

Finally after all those years, eight years at that time, the Conservative government was going to put its money where its mouth is and reform the regulatory environment. Those members had heard the same thing in 1984.

The minister at that time, the present Minister for International Trade, made it very clear that this was a top priority of this government. It was not a middle level priority. It was a top priority. He said in November 1984 in his economic statement: "There is a clear need for a national telecommunications policy to take advantage of the opportunities presented by rapidly advancing technology and the growing demand by Canadians for new telecommunication services". Nothing at all happened.

Then we get another minister, the hon. member for Frontenac. In a speech to the Canadian Bar Association on February 12, 1986 he said basically the same thing. The clock was ticking. There was a need for reform and they certainly knew how to say it in speeches. They singularly were unimpressive in their ability to bring those changes by way of legislation to the floor of the House.

The then minister said: "The fundamental revision of the policy and regulatory framework which allows the telecommunications industry to realize its potential has thus become a priority for me and for the government. I tackled reforms head-on while establishing the basic principles that should inspire it". That was in 1986.

It was seven or eight years after that before anything happened. It seems every time a minister wanted to impress somebody in the industry about their ability to grapple with complex matters they gave a speech and made a promise. Like all Tory promises, it was written in invisible ink.

As soon as it was said, the cameras were turned off, the microphones were put away and so were the intentions to come in with a solid piece of regulatory reform.

Flora MacDonald, the former member for Kingston and the Islands, came in with great fanfare and a paper that dealt with this very subject matter. Even the great Flora MacDonald who hailed originally from Cape Breton Island did not have the clout at that time to bring forward a piece of legislation and convince her cabinet colleagues that this was an important matter to have put on the agenda.

Then in 1992, after eight solid years of promises but no action, this minister tabled a bill. I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that those who are experts in the field and who study this for a living in Parliament said: "Finally we have a piece of legislation that we can work on. If the process is allowed to unfold as it should we will have significant consultation with the interested Canadians and parties in the Canadian economy so that we can do this thing right". Like with a lot of the promises that are made on the opposite side, they stalled, sputtered and just did not go forward.

• (1830)

I tried to figure this out. My colleague from Winnipeg says that they dithered. I could not figure this out because the minister who has introduced this bill has a long history in this place and I think is respected by most members of Parliament.

This minister came in with a great promise. I can remember the press conference. I could not figure out what in the name of goodness would have dampened his tenacity and his resolve to get this thing through the process properly. I underline properly because properly means that we allow for reasonable and full debate. It means that members go to committee and allow all interested parties to appear and to put their points of view on the record dealing with the legislation. It means that it comes back here for report stage after that thorough examination at committee and that at report stage there is full debate. Then it goes on for third reading. Then it goes to the other place, to the Senate of Canada to go through a similar process.

How naive I was to think that the government that has used closure and time allocation more than any other

government in the history of the country would treat this bill any differently. How naive I was to think that the minister opposite was going to have the resolve, the tenacity and the commitment to go through a full process.

I am going to spend the rest of my time talking about the process because it stinks, it sucks big time. It is the type of process that the bunch opposite go through all the time which has led Canadians to be cynical at best about what we all do in this place, and at worst to condemn us all for what we do or do not do on their behalf in this place, the highest court in the land.

We waited. The bill was pre-studied. The Senate felt that it was such an important bill it wanted to pre-study it. It pre-studied it in June of last year and came forward I am told by my colleague from Mount Royal with a number of substantive changes to the legislation. That was what it was recommending. We did not see that piece of legislation coming back to the House of Commons.

This legislation has 138 or 139 clauses. It is a large technical piece of legislation, dealing with a very cumbersome and difficult to understand regulatory environment. The Senate did its job. It pre-studied it and came in with recommendations. When we did not see this bill back before the House we thought one of two things: either it no longer was a priority, that it had slipped off the list, off the agenda, as it had from all the previous ministers including the Minister of Finance, who gave nice flowery speeches but produced no solid piece of legislation; or the government was re-writing it, that it had looked at the Senate report and said there are a lot of things it has to do so it had better come back in with a new and substantially altered bill.

We did not get it. Ten months later, April 19 1993, the bill came in for second reading and there was time allocation. This minister had 14 or 15 months to put it before the Chamber. Either he did not think it was a priority or he had other personal priorities at the time, such as deciding whether or not to run for the leadership of his party, so he was preoccupied, or the House leader would not listen to him. I do not know which is worse.

What I do know is that we had 14 months in order to put this through the process without a shotgun at anybody's temple and allow the bill and the process to proceed. But the government was not satisfied and used time allocation at second reading.

It was sent to committee. I am not on the committee and I am not an expert in this field, but I am told that when it went to committee not everybody could be heard. There were hearings over a period of two weeks. They were not hearings that went from morning through noon and night. They were not non-stop hearings so every interested party could be heard. They were regular committee hearings with the government majority saying: "Two weeks she's up. You can get *x* number of people here and the rest. They will have to append it, they will have to send it in, because we are simply not going to hear them". After 14 months of doing nothing, the committee was told on this very complex bill that it only had two weeks to hear all the witnesses. Can you imagine Mr. Speaker? It is the same type of thing the government has done with us time and time again on other pieces of legislation that have come through this place. If it does not like what it hears and its political agenda is otherwise, it just throws caution to the wind and says: "To heck with the process and the priorities in this House". It forgets the rights of members of this place to speak on behalf of their constituents and the rights of all Canadians when this type of legislation comes forward to be heard. The government does not care about that.

• (1835)

The government came back June 1 at report stage with an hour and a half of debate. The minister was sitting there and told me: "We are going to have to have time allocation. We simply cannot allow the opposition parties to debate this bill. My goodness, it is a filibuster". He would not know a filibuster from a filly.

I asked him before exactly what his definition of filibuster was. He got so flustered he could not even talk about filibuster. The minister asked my colleague from London a question: "Is it not true that the member for Mount Royal said she would filibuster?" The member for Mount Royal is probably one of the most productive members of this place. She takes her job seriously and fights hard. If the minister was honest and up front he would indicate that this bill that is going through this place today is a better bill because of the input she and other members like the New Democratic Party member made during the committee hearings.

When the bill came back from committee at report stage after truncated committee hearings the minister, on behalf of the government, introduced over 50 motions which my legal people tell me if they had been properly

worded would have meant about 100 amendments to a bill that has only 138 or 139 clauses.

Think about it. If the alarm bells were not ringing by that point they should have rung for him that the bill that was brought in originally 14 months before was in shambles. Either the premises that the bill was based on were wrong or the drafters were drunk when they did it. It was unconscionable.

The opposition parties came in with nearly 50 proposed amendments but life goes on. The Tories are having a leadership convention. They want to get as much legislation barrelled through this place as they possibly can so they can change leaders mid-stream. They could not care less about the legislative process so once again we have time allocation.

These members opposite use time allocation like some people use laxatives. Every time they get stuck they take a time allocation pill. They have used time allocation 30 times in this Parliament. They have used closure 15 times. They have thwarted the rights of parliamentarians and Canadians 45 times. They have used that bloody blunt instrument, tyranny of the majority called time allocation and closure. Then they have the nerve to say it is the opposition parties that are trying to hold up this "important" piece of legislation. Perhaps the thought of a new Prime Minister has forced this minister to go on bended knee to try to get the House leader to allow this piece of legislation to come forth.

In closing I think this is the type of bill that should be passed. There are a lot of flaws and things we do not like in it but we understand that the industry must be supported. We also understand that if we left this industry to the devices of the bunch opposite, particularly the Minister of Communications, I do not know where in the name of goodness they would go. This minister did nothing but dither for 14 months. In the final analysis the bill that is before us is not a perfect bill but it seeks to try to streamline the regulatory environment.

My reason for standing today is to speak to the process part of this bill. I think Canadians have a right to know and remember just how this government approaches legislation and just how this government approaches the rights of parliamentarians and the Canadians they represent.

• (1840)

Mr. Murray W. Dorin (Edmonton Northwest): Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on the previous hon. member's speech.

He complained about the process but that seems to be a rather hollow complaint. We are trying to determine here whether or not this legislation is positive for Canada and the Canadian economy and whether or not it will improve the economy and create jobs among other things.

I think the suggestion that somehow the process should have been different can be refuted very simply by the comment of the hon. member for Mount Royal who made this statement in committee: "I forewarn you that you will have a filibuster in this House that you will not believe and you will not get this bill without calling closure". That is on the record and I do not think I have to repeat it. Let us deal with the substance of the bill.

An hon. member: You call that a filibuster?

Mr. Dorin: Earlier today the legislation to implement the North American free trade agreement was passed through committee. I would like to talk about what this bill can do for the telecommunications industry in Canada and particularly the province of Alberta where you, Mr. Speaker, and I come from because I think we want to talk about the positive aspects of this bill.

An hon. member: What about 820 B.C. Tel jobs that are down the tube?

Mr. Dorin: I will try to get past the rhetoric. I am going to talk about jobs if I am allowed to by the opposition.

The telecommunications industry has undergone significant changes in recent years and we understand that. Technological innovation has enabled the introduction of a wide range of new services and has fundamentally altered the market structure of the industry.

Some jobs have changed but overall there has been enormous growth in this industry. This is a leading industry in Canada and an industry where we are competitive world-wide. We have many more opportunities to be competitive, including in Mexico, given the

auspices and the Mexican free trade agreement which has just passed committee this afternoon.

One of the greatest changes brought about by recent technological developments is the creation of commercial opportunities for competitive service providers. With or without new legislation the stage has been set for the forces of change to accelerate and strengthen for years to come.

Competition in telecommunications has already brought benefits for Canadians and will continue to benefit Canadians. We see the market opportunities in telecommunications which is an important industry for Canada. It is a growing industry that employs 125,000 people and generates more than $21 billion in revenues.

I would like to ask the hon. member a question. There are opportunities in such places as Mexico where the telecommunications sector is being deregulated and privatized, opening private investment and service opportunities in areas such as cellular telephones, construction and the administration of the microwave earth stations. Between 1990—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I hope the hon. member will put his question.

Mr. Dorin: It is important that the bill pass today and provide opportunities for us to enter into that market.

Mr. MacDonald (Dartmouth): Mr. Speaker, that was quite the question. I am still not sure what he asked but he is a good reader. He reads his notes from the minister well. He will get full marks for that.

The hon. member for Mississauga South said something in this House one day that the hon. member for Edmonton Northwest should have listened to. If he did not hear it he should call it up on our electronic Hansard through OASIS.

The member said one day in debate that the hon. member should understand that a lot of people talked their way into this House but they should also understand that a lot of members talk their way out of this House. I think the nonsense that was just spit out by the hon. member for Edmonton Northwest is testament to that. Sometimes people should know when to keep their lips closed.

• (1845)

I will address the question of the member opposite, and perhaps I will be able to address the question of the member over here if he gets a chance to ask it. What I would like to say to the member for Edmonton Northwest is that this promise of new opportunity and new jobs that the Tories like to spout about with the North American free trade deal is exactly the rhetoric that they spit out during the 1988 campaign about the huge opportunities that would be given to Canadians with the free trade deal. We know full well that rhetoric has fallen completely flat.

We know full well that the Ontario manufacturing sector, since this bunch opposite promised jobs, jobs, jobs because of that free trade deal—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): It being 6.45 p.m., pursuant to order made Tuesday, June 8, 1993, in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 78(3), it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the third reading stage of the bill now before the House.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Call in the members.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

Private Members' Business

(Division No. 531)

YEAS

Members

Anderson
Arseneault
Atkinson
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bélair
Berger
Bjornson
Blenkarn
Brightwell
Caccia
Casey
Chadwick
Chartrand
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clifford
Collins
Corbeil
Côté
Crawford
Danis
DeBlois
Della Noce
Dick
Dobbie
Dorin
Duplessis
Epp
Feltham
Ferland
Fontaine
Fretz
Gagliano
Greene
Guilbault
Harb
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hicks
Hopkins
Horning
James
Johnson
Jordan
Kempling
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Landry
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lewis
Loiselle
MacAulay
MacDonald (Dartmouth)
MacKay
Malone
Marchi
Marleau
Masse
Mazankowski
McDermid
Merrithew
Mills
Monteith
Nault
Nunziata
O'Kurley
Peterson
Pickard
Porter
Proud
Reimer
Robitaille
Saint-Julien
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Siddon
Sparrow
Stevenson
Tétreault
Thompson
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vien
Andre
Assad
Attewell
Beatty
Belsher
Bertrand
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Bosley
Browes
Cadieux
Catterall
Champagne (Champlain)
Clancy
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Darling
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dingwall
Domm
Duhamel
Edwards
Fee
Ferguson
Flis
Fontana
Friesen
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Guarnieri
Halliday
Harvard
Hawkes
Hogue
Horner
Hughes
Jelinek
Joncas
Jourdenais
Keyes
Koury
Larrivée
Lee
Littlechild
Lopez
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacDougall (Timiskaming—French River)
MacLellan
Manley
Marin
Martin (Lasalle—Émard)
Mayer
McCreath
McKnight
Mifflin
Mitges
Moore
Nicholson
Oberle
Pagtakhan
Phinney
Plourde
Pronovost
Redway
Ricard
Rompkey
Schneider
Shields
Soetens
Speller
Tardif
Thacker
Thorkelson
Tremblay (Lotbinière)
Van De Walle
Vézina
Vincent
Weiner
Wilbee
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)
Wood
Wenman
Winegard
Worthy—168

NAYS

Members

Angus
Benjamin
Blaikie
Duceppe
Harvey (Edmonton East)
Hovdebo
Kristiansen
MacWilliam
Riis
Whittaker—19
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Black
Breaugh
Edmonston
Heap
Karpoff
Langan (Mission—Coquitlam)
Parker
Waddell

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anawak
Blais
Hockin
Karygiannis
Martin (Lincoln)
McGuire
Reid
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Hudon
Langlois
McDougall (St. Paul's)
Milliken
Walker

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I declare the motion carried.

Bill read the third time and passed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Pursuant to Standing Order 30(6), the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

POLICE FORCES

RECOGNITION OF PROFESSIONALISM

Ms. Albina Guarnieri (Mississauga East) moved:

That this House recognize the professionalism, personal sacrifice and dedication shown by members of Canada's many police forces in the course of carrying out their duties in the service of Canadians.

• (1915)

She said: Mr. Speaker, because so many of my colleagues wish to speak to the motion I will be sharing my time with them.

It is barely a year ago that Toronto's Yonge Street erupted in violence. Criminals took the occasion to loot and vandalize, hiding behind the aftermath of a police shooting in a back alley.

Standing by and eventually interceding, of course, were scores of metro Toronto police, ordinary citizens who serve and endure in a most extraordinary role in our society. Last May metro police were asked to defend the streets from looters while the provincial government was only too ready to point an accusing finger at all police officers.

What happened last May was not the fault of police chiefs, police training or police attitudes in Canada. The entire circumstance was more a response to the Rodney King case and the L.A. riots than anything that occurred in Canada.

Accusations hurled down upon our police forces. Every police officer stood accused regardless of attitudes, values or performance. The police officers in my district were gripped by an overwhelming sense that they were being hung out to dry in order to quell unrest, not of their making or really the responsibility of the vast majority of police officers.

Policing is the profession of dealing with tragedy. Police have to comfort and question the victims of murderers, rapists, armed bandits, drug dealers and then apprehend the assailants.

It is not the police who plant the seeds of crime. Society endures the level of crime that the government is willing to tolerate. The prevailing view of Canadians is that our revolving door justice system provides little deterrent to criminals and even less protection for society.

Many believe that crime starts with an inadequate education system that fails to inspire a third of all students to even finish high school. Without the tools to make an honest living it is too easy to take advantage of an environment that tolerates crime.

Perhaps our social service structure is to blame for depriving children of positive role models in their homes and denying them the opportunity to participate fully in society. I lament for the futures of children who are raised in homes where no one has ever worked, where no one gets up at seven o'clock to go to a job, where no one has ever received a promotion, a raise or any reward for hard work.

This is not an environment that instils a work ethic or even the concept that success comes through honest work. This is a breeding ground for criminals, criminals who will learn that our justice system will tolerate a career of burglary, car theft or even more serious crimes. The failings of our education system, our social services and justice system are laid right at the feet of our police forces.

The NDP government in Ontario was keen on showing its willingness to compromise and undermine the authority and capability of police forces with new regulations that served only to reinforce the perception that the police were to blame for the tragic consequences of crime. Obscured from view was the daunting task of policing a province preyed upon by growing numbers of well armed criminals.

It is no wonder that police forces report a decline in morale when more and more is asked of them by society while governments seem grossly preoccupied with the protection of criminals.

By and large Canadians feel betrayed by Parliament, the courts and the parole board that have failed to keep dangerous criminals out of their neighbourhoods. The same sense of betrayal does not extend to the police who deservedly remain in the highest esteem among law-abiding Canadians.

• (1920)

Canadians are always fascinated by the remarkable ability of police to solve crimes with the sparsest of clues. Just the other day we saw a suspect tracked down in Brooklyn for a shooting not long ago in Scarborough.

Canada's police have indeed risen above their detractors to continue to provide the high quality of policing that Canadians enjoy, but 1992 will burn long in the memories of Canada's police forces. Officers not only had to endure the stress and expense of political show trials, they actually had to read articles suggesting they were somehow favoured by the court system. In how many occupations is a worker ordered into a potentially life-threatening situation and crucified if he survives?

Police have an over-used motto that it is better to be tried by 12 than carried by 6. This is a terrible choice that officers face every day. When they are ordered to confront a suspect in a crime they have to decide whether to endure additional risk to themselves or potentially provide evidence against themselves by drawing a weapon and filing a report that may eventually be resurrected to impugn their characters.

Each time they stop a car they never know whether the driver is armed, on drugs, a hood or an upstanding member of the community. They just do not know. When a suspect pulls a knife or other weapon how much risk is it reasonable for police officers to accept? How close is too close? How much danger are they paid to accept? What happens if an officer does make a mistake?

An officer is ordered into a situation. Perhaps he does not have complete information and perhaps acts too quickly. Is that officer a criminal? Does this warrant years of prosecution, recriminations and protests.

We live in an increasingly violent society with greater risks to police officers than ever before. They have to behave more defensively, act more quickly and on less information. If they do not they could end up like the 213 Canadian police officers who have already been killed in the line of duty.

There are few certainties on the streets of major urban centres, but what is certain is that the police are targeted not only by criminals but by publicity seekers and malcontents. Rarely do we hear any mention or praise of the remarkable effort and success of our police force in solving crimes. We never hear about unpaid overtime by detectives who do not just go through the motions of investigating crimes but aggressively try to make the neighbourhood safer.

A recent parliamentary report declared that war must be waged on the roots of crime: poverty, the lack of education and other social ills. It says that more police and prisons are not the answer, and of course that is right in the long term. What is painfully clear is that no new efforts whatsoever are being proposed by the government to reduce unemployment or poverty or to improve education. Even if measures were put in place immediately they would take years to show up in crime statistics and do little to dissuade the career criminals that plague our streets today.

The current crop of criminals is the exclusive purview of the parole board, the courts and Parliament. The confidence that Canadians once had in these institutions has been shaken by such cases as the Stephenson inquest and repeated reports of dangerous criminals being returned to society.

Only Canada's police forces remain in the highest esteem among our citizens. Regrettably this esteem is based on familiarity caused by rising crime and a rising number of contacts with officers investigating crimes. They realize more and more that their local police officers are not just there to get a pay cheque, but take an active interest in protecting their homes and families. Many Canadians who hear dire assessments about abusive police find those assessments a stark contrast to their own experiences.

When I randomly surveyed my constituents about our police I discovered a respect and admiration for our forces that transcends the diversity of our community.

• (1925)

I believe that ultimately every citizen will form an opinion based on his or her own experience with our police and overwhelmingly people are struck by the professionalism and sincerity of officers who have served us all so well.

We should always seek to improve our police forces. Of course we need to have police that reflect the communities in which they serve and are sensitive to the concerns of women and minorities but this progress will not be achieved by angry denials of the strides already made or the fine work that is already being done.

We need to recognize that there are thousands of police officers in Canada on countless municipal and provincial forces as well as the RCMP. We can no longer view police as convenient scapegoats for social ills that Parliament refuses to address. The police guard the end zones of our society and rarely see the products of our institutions until they are a serious threat to cross the line and cause harm.

Last year the number of stolen or missing guns reached 62,000. They are 62,000 weapons that could well be in the hands of gangs, hoods or deranged maniacs. As more and more illegal and unregistered guns surface on our streets we can expect more violence and more tragic incidents involving police officers. Undoubtedly there will eventually be a 214th officer killed in the line of duty.

When these tragedies occur what remains most difficult to accept for the families is that the names of criminals shot by police will be remembered longer than the names of police shot by criminals. It seems ironic that society sometimes prefers to mourn a criminal killed in an attempt to victimize society than any of the more

than 200 police officers who have been killed trying to protect society.

Canadians should remember the names of Richard Hopkins of the OPP who died on May 9, 1982 at the age of 31 and Dwayne Piukkala of the Peel Regional Police who died at the age of 24 in August 1984. We should also remember David Dunmore, Pierre Beaulieu, John Ross, David Utman, William Grant, Vernon Miller, Allen Giesbrecht, Michael Buday, Jacques Giguere, Yves Tetu, Donald Campbell, Jacinthe Fyfe, Mario Tessier, Richard Thomas, Budd Johansson, Frederick Abel, Claude St. Laurent, Mario Simard, Robert Baril, Gordon Kowalczyk, Larry Young, Emmanuel Aucoin, Derek Flanagan, Ezio Faraone, Marcel Lemay, Yves Phaneuf, Thomas Cooper, Scott Rossiter, Andrew Gordon and Robert Vanderwiel, all killed by deliberate criminal action in the last 10 years. How often do we hear of their sacrifice or concern ourselves with those who take the same risks today?

The motion does not ask the government to enact any new program or policy. It simply asks the House to recognize that our police forces have served Canadians very well and deserve more than a little respect and support from their governments.

The enemy of Canadians is crime not their police. I hope that the morale of Canada's police officers will be buoyed by a unanimous vote in this House to recognize their efforts in the service of Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Monique Tardif (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, I would like to start by congratulating the hon. member for Mississauga East on her motion stressing the professionalism and dedication shown by members of Canada's many police forces, often at the expense of their private lives, in the course of carrying out their duties in the service of Canadians.

• (1930)

Despite the visible presence of the police in our communities, we seldom bother to formally express our thanks to this very important group in our society that is so dedicated to its profession.

Twenty-three years ago, the police introduced National Police Week in Canada to strengthen their ties with communities and make the public more aware of their work. This year, National Police Week was held from May 9 to May 15.

We must admit that, thanks to the commitment of these men and women, Canadians enjoy a relative degree of safety.

By the end of 1990, Canada had more than 55,000 full-time police officers. Every day, they fight a difficult battle against crime, in addition to dealing with the many problems that exist in our society. They are often the target of criticism and complaints, because of their chosen profession. However, no one is more intent on doing everything they possibly can to maintain a just and tolerant society than these police officers, who knowingly risk their lives in the line of duty.

It is not easy to be a police officer in these changing times. In Canada, police officers and police forces face unprecedented challenges.

Issues like relations with ethnic groups, youth gangs, violent crime, organized crime, drug trafficking and crimes against the environment are all there, waiting to be dealt with.

These concurrent demands are forcing the police to constantly reassess their approach and to look for new ways of dealing with the problems head on. Despite the current climate of budgetary restraint, many police forces have made substantial progress in adjusting to our changing society.

Since police personnel are on the front lines, we expect them to react quickly to change. These expectations put tremendous stress on the police, both personally and professionally, but it is a challenge that they meet with courage and determination.

What steps have been taken to deal with the changes that are taking place in our society? Community policing and multiculturally oriented policing, which includes aboriginal police and relations with minorities, are a few examples.

Police forces are now in a situation where they must determine what is important and what direction they should follow.

Today, chiefs of police forces are questioning the old professional and organizational values and trying to instill new ones. They are considering new strategies, at a time when they are trying to deal with recent events connected with police surveillance.

To introduce new values, many police forces have adopted a mission statement and statements of principle to guide their officers.

The emphasis on values will encourage the police to ask themselves where they are going and how they will adjust to the changes in our society. They must take an honest and open approach to the problems they encounter today. It is the only way our constantly evolving communities will have the feeling that they really count.

The police are working very hard to meet the new standards they have set for themselves, and they are gaining public support.

We in government must realize that the police work in a changing environment and that this imposes certain constraints. However, solving current problems is not only a concern of the federal government but of the provinces and the municipalities as well.

In October 1990, the Department of the Solicitor General released a document under the title: *Vision of the future of Policing in Canada*. In this document, there are proposals for new structures for our police forces that will make them better able to fight crime in the year 2000. The report stresses how important it is for the community to work with the police, to control crime and maintain law and order at local and regional levels. There is also an emphasis on the need for co-operation among the various groups.

The document introduces the concept of community policing as a new, interesting and important approach to policing.

The Government of Canada, through the Department of the Solicitor General, supports the concept of community policing. This approach, today considered as very advanced, makes it possible for police officers to take advantage of the ties they have created with the communities they serve in order to perform duties more effectively.

• (1935)

This concept is increasingly widespread because it encourages co-operation between the police and the public in identifying the causes of crime and finding solutions. Partnership is therefore a key element of community policing. With this sharing of responsibilities, the public's need for police services will be better met.

The community policing approach is closely tied to crime prevention. We cannot talk about the work police do in Canada without mentioning the time and great effort they put into crime prevention activities. Whether it is drug awareness programs for children and teenagers or safety initiation campaigns for seniors, the police plays a leading role in our crime prevention efforts.

We studied with interest the new report on crime prevention of the Standing Committee on Justice and the Solicitor General, and we support it. This document will give us a direction and a solid foundation for our future crime prevention efforts.

Relations between the police and various ethnic groups is another important area where the police have made progress. They are now more attentive to the needs of the communities they serve. Canada must remain a country whose citizens can live in complete security. The values of police forces and the way services are provided are in line with this principle. We are trying to eliminate discrimination in police services provided to visible minorities. The police forces are determined to implement innovative policies and practices that will guarantee effective services in a multicultural society. A great deal of progress has already been made in this area.

Canadians must know that our police services have a reputation for being innovative and forward-looking and are considered leaders internationally. We must be proud of that.

The Government of Canada cares about public safety. For police services in Canada to be effective and efficient, we must ensure that excellent relations are maintained by all concerned—governments, the police and the communities served. Through constant communication, we can help the police in Canada maintain the excellence of its services. As police services continue to adjust to the changing needs of our society, it will be more important than ever for us, as partners in this venture, to work together to fight crime as effectively as possible.

There is no doubt that the police forces in Canada are doing a remarkable job which must not go unnoticed. The government recognizes the dedication shown by police officers throughout the country, and we promise to continue to support their excellent work.

During Police Week, I spoke to some police officers in Hull. What struck me particularly is that when they were being recognized for their work, we found members of the Hull police but also OPP and RCMP officers who had done tremendous services in that city. We also found citizens who had co-operated with the police to give that city a better security image and to promote greater public confidence. It is our role to take part in that kind of meeting because it is also up to us to encourage people to realize that it is partly their responsibility.

In closing, I would like to thank my colleague, the hon. member for Mississauga East, for giving us this opportunity to highlight the good work done by our police.

[*English*]

Mr. Jack Whittaker (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to add my voice and that of my party, the New Democratic Party, to those who have already spoken. I congratulate the hon. member for Mississauga East for putting forward this motion. It reads:

> That this House recognize the professionalism, personal sacrifice and dedication shown by members of Canada's many police forces in the course of carrying our their duties in the service of Canadians.

I would like to bring a different perspective than what we have already heard here today, the perspective of one who lives in a more rural setting and who has worked with the police over the past 20 years, both as a prosecutor and as a defence counsel.

• (1940)

My dealings with the police have shown that they must be not just police officers but they must be social workers, counsellors, life savers, medical people, coaches and public relations people within the community. All of these things are part of the everyday life of police.

In the province of British Columbia the rural areas are policed for the most part by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, a police force that I would suggest all Canadians are very proud of, whether it be ceremonially, for the work they do within the communities or for their reputation internationally as perhaps one of the leading police forces in Canada.

Others have spoken about the police forces in specific cities or in specific provinces. I take nothing at all away from the work that they do, but I want to emphasize, as a person who has worked for, worked with and socialized with police officers, that I have grown to respect not only the fact that they put their lives on the line many times in their police work, but the fact that they get involved in their communities and that often they must put their duties ahead of their own personal family lives.

In recognizing the dedication and personal sacrifice I specifically talk about some of the problems that police in small communities have in being transferred out every few years as is the policy of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the fact that they often spend long hours. In some of the work they have to do they become very jaded by getting too close to some things, whether it be in undercover drug work or in the motorcycle squad that followed the motorcycle gangs around for years. They have difficulty in all of their undercover work in not being able to pay adequate attention to their own families and personal lives. That great personal sacrifice of these people often leads to separation and ultimately divorce and separated families.

I think of the number of people within this House who know the sacrifices that they make in being away from their families and going about their duties as members of Parliament. Similarly those sacrifices are made by members of our police forces in the hard work that they do for our communities.

In talking about police officers as medical officers I know that in many cases police officers are called to scenes of accidents which are not pretty sights. They are often the first on the scene after whoever originally called in the call, or discover people who are clinging to the last remnants of life. It is their duty to go in and try to assist, sometimes in very unpleasant circumstances with the blood and the screaming of those left. They are trained to deal with that in everyday life.

I recall just recently a young woman constable in British Columbia was given a special award for being on the scene when a gentleman had an attack and his heart quit. This young woman had just taken a course in CPR two or three weeks previous. She used her training to bring him back. He is healthy again, I am pleased to say. The young woman constable has been recognized not just for doing what she saw as her duty, but having done

it in a timely and professional fashion as I think we have all come to expect of these police officers.

I think of a number of gruesome cases that I participated in as both prosecutor and defence in murder trials, sexual assault trials and double murder suicides where the police officers were the ones who had to go in and deal with the traumatic scenes in front of them, in a professional manner and take their notes. However, that was not all.

• (1945)

Once they had done that it was often up to the police officer to act as priest, family counsellor or social worker in going to the families of those deceased to tell them in a compassionate manner that someone they loved and cherished was no longer with them. They had met an untimely death, whether through an accident, due to drinking and driving, someone else's fault, or whether they were a victim of a murder or an assault or whatever.

I have come to respect not just the training of our many police forces and police officers but the personal commitment they bring to their job. They bring commitment to their communities whether it is coaching a ball team, a minor hockey team, participating in local sports or getting involved in the community. They are not only part of the community, they are often the very pulse of the community.

I am proud to have been associated with the police. I know they work hard and I am very pleased to be able to add my voice to those speaking on this motion today.

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in commending the hon. member for Mississauga East for having taken the initiative to recognize the positive accomplishments of police officers throughout Canada.

The member for Hamilton Mountain, the member for Ottawa Centre and I were talking a little while ago and we were observing how it is that in our society we often tend to accentuate the negative as opposed to the positive. For that reason alone my colleagues would have liked to have addressed this motion too.

Let me give an example of something that happened today. It does not happen only with the police forces. We have a colleague who yesterday celebrated 40 years of outstanding service in political office. He is an outstanding Canadian, outstanding Manitoban, a member of the Manitoba legislative assembly for some years, the leader of the provincial Liberal Party of Manitoba and a Senator for a number of years, Senator Gildas Molgat. That would have gone absolutely unnoticed if someone had not told me and I was able to share it with colleagues.

I gave that example because here was a sound accomplishment and one worthy of being noted and yet if he had done the slightest little negative thing I am sure it would have been reported throughout the country.

So it is with police officers. They make mistakes, as we all do, but we tend to accentuate the mistakes and not see the positives. What I want to do today is talk about some of the positives. I want to talk about, from a somewhat biased perspective if you wish, the city of Winnipeg. I was in contact with the city of Winnipeg Police Department and want to share very quickly some of the positive things that are happening in my city.

For example we have what we call the CAT or combat auto theft program. We have a particular decal that is registered with the police. If the police spot this vehicle between 12 midnight and 5 a.m. they can stop to see whether you are the registered driver. It is to reduce the number of car thefts.

We have the community constable program where constables spend much more time with individuals in the community. They try to understand community needs and our citizenry much better than they have in the past.

We have the victim services unit where there is liaison between the police department and crime victims who often have difficulties adjusting to whatever it is that has occurred to them.

We have store–front policing where the introduction of more foot patrols in Winnipeg has led to the establishment of a number of neighbourhood police substations. These are high profile offices which serve as bases for foot patrols as well as public information depots. That has gone on now for some time and has been very successful.

We have what we call bicycle cops, which I do not say in the pejorative sense through which the Winnipeg police department will be increasing the personal contact between the police and the community by having many

of its officers travel about on bicycles. These are just summaries of rather elaborate programs.

We also have the Winnipeg police department which has doubled the number of aboriginal members in the past two years. The current number stands at 49 with 8 more aboriginals entering training next week. They all recognize that we have to do more in this area.

The department now employs 63 female constables and has made efforts to encourage more women to apply. We recognize that is but a beginning. We need more representatives from our female population.

• (1950)

Substantial efforts have been made to encourage visible minorities to join the department. We have had some successes but we need to have more. In Winnipeg there has been an increase in the number of French-speaking services. These are all positive initiatives by that particular police department that often go unnoticed.

Let me briefly refer to some of the challenges the police officers face, such as youth crime and gangs. The police want amendments to the Young Offenders Act to deal with the growing problem. It is a serious situation and the police need our help and support. There is the issue of drug use. Many violent crimes and property offences can be traced to drug use and abuse. There is credit card fraud, and prostitution among 14 and 15-year olds or even younger is not uncommon. There is solvent abuse, gas sniffing, organized crime—very often mostly drug related—violent crime, sexual assault, wife abuse and property crimes. These are some of the challenges facing the police department and there are many more.

We have a police chief who once a week, I am told, goes out on midnight shift with his officers to see what it is really like out there. He is to be commended because he is the kind of person who is showing the leadership required today to go out with those who do the work to better understand what is needed out there.

I would be remiss if I were not to say that my colleague from Ottawa Centre wanted to congratulate the new police chief in Ottawa, Brian Ford, and commend the police force of the City of Ottawa for the fine work it is doing.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I would simply summarize by saying that I am very glad that my colleague sponsored this motion, because for the first time in a long while we are talking about the positive accomplishments of a police force like this one and like those working throughout Canada. That pleases me tremendously.

[*English*]

Mr. Rey Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my colleague's motion to recognize the labours of the police forces that protect all Canadians. I certainly thank the member for Mississauga East for her initiative through the Liberal tradition.

As a former citizen member of the Winnipeg Police Commission on which I served for three years I have seen first-hand the dedication of these people to their trusts as they perform community policing and face the challenges posed by youth gangs and even organized crime.

Usually we discount recognition for their efforts. They nonetheless persevere year in and year out to ensure that Canadians can walk down the streets and not be harmed, and drive home late at night and not be killed.

At night when most other people are asleep members of our police forces are alert, responding to emergency calls and maintaining order, sometimes at the risk of their own lives. They risk their own lives when they are sometimes infected with disease-contaminated blood as they attend to medical rescue and emergency situations.

I am at this juncture reminded of another bill, Bill C-333, now under study by a committee of this House. Members of the police force are truly threatened when they attend to emergency situations. This bill will provide for an infectious disease notification system to allay unnecessary anxiety on the part of emergency personnel. It will eliminate the need for an expensive follow-up and reduce the invasion of personal privacy decisions regarding the prevention of transmission of infectious diseases such as AIDS, hepatitis and others.

I would like to take this opportunity to ask members of this House to also support this other piece of legislation

which will protect those who protect us when it comes back for final consideration in this House.

The personal sacrifice of our police officers is inspiring in a day when belief in heroism regrettably is being questioned. Most of the time the public only notices their failures and not their successes. Yet these dedicated professionals continue to serve. Indeed it can be a very thankless job.

• (1955)

I applaud my colleague, the member for Mississauga East, on her motion. I urge all members of the House to recognize the professionalism, personal sacrifice and dedication shown by members of Canada's many police forces, national such as the RCMP and local in every town and city across the country, as they carry out their duties in the service of all Canadians.

They risk their own lives to ensure the safety of Canadians, their person and the security of their property. They risk their own lives so that our lives may not be at risk. They serve us. Let us with deep conviction recognize them with gratitude.

I am confident that my constituents of Winnipeg North join me in supporting this motion and saluting our police forces from coast to coast.

Mr. Jesse Flis (Parkdale—High Park): Mr. Speaker, many Canadians are probably not aware there are approximately 1,771 police departments in Canada, all the way from the Newfoundland Constabulary to the Victoria City Police Force in British Columbia. There are approximately 55,000 Canadians serving as police officers in Canada. I am not forgetting the important role played by the auxiliary police and the cadets.

I am pleased to hear from my colleague from Manitoba that a growing number of women are now serving in the police forces. We see that in Ontario also.

Let me share a few facts about various levels of policing. First, the RCMP has quite a tradition and history in Canada. Canada is the only country in the world known for its national police force, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, RCMP or *la Gendarmerie royale du Canada*. There are approximately 15,000 RCMP officers in Canada. The RCMP made history as one of the first police forces to be called upon by the United Nations secretary-general to serve in peacekeeping operations.

To date the RCMP has assisted in the development of civilian police forces in Namibia, the former Yugoslavia and Cambodia where I had the privilege of observing the first elections from May 23 to May 28. As more countries move from authoritarian systems to democratic systems of government, more and more of our police forces will be called upon to train other police forces in other countries.

The motto of the RCMP is: "Maintain the law". I think we are here to make legislation. The RCMP is there to maintain the legislation that we pass.

The motto of the Ontario Provincial Police, the OPP, is: "Times change and we change with them". It is a motto everyone should keep in mind. The reason the popularity of the government and the Prime Minister is so low is that he did not change with the times. This was evident in the Constitution, the NAFTA, et cetera.

The motto of the metropolitan Toronto police known as metro's finest is: "To serve and protect". On their cars and so on we see that sign: "To serve and protect".

A lot of excellent preventative work is done by local police. I am reminded when I was in the classroom of how the police used to come in and teach kindergarten children safety rules, to stop, look and listen before they cross the street. The police work with a number of community groups to fight drugs and prostitution and to reduce the number of break and enters in larger cities such as where my riding is situated.

I did a survey in my riding recently. In response to a question with respect to law enforcement: "Do you believe that the police should have more power, less power, et cetera" 62 per cent felt that police needed more power to enforce the law while only 2 per cent said that they had too much power.

In response to the question of who should be doing more to fight crime and improve street safety in Parkdale—High Park in the same survey, 72 per cent felt the courts and elected officials should be doing more to fight crime, indicating a high level of community satisfaction with police services in my Toronto riding.

As in other provinces I too have services offered by the police on foot patrol, in cars, on horseback and on bicycles. A new one introduced a year ago is the golf cart. Golf carts are becoming a very important vehicle in parks, especially parks such as High Park. The police now are providing much better service. It was their profes-

sionalism and their creativity that suggested we use not only the horse, the bicycle and the car, but also golf carts.

The Liberal Party recently released a crime and justice policy which calls on the community to take a larger role in crime prevention in conjunction with the local police forces. That is what is happening in my riding of Parkdale—High Park. The community now is setting standards. It is getting together with the police, working together. This is the only way we are going to reduce crime in our communities, and that is for the entire community to get together.

I have about a minute, Mr. Speaker. If you could not see the clock for a minute I would like to finish here because this is a very important motion.

Unlike most people in Canada, police officers put their lives on the line every day. The friends and families of police officers also live with the fear that one day their mother, father, sister, brother or partner may not come home. If we all support this motion posed by the member for Mississauga East and the entire country gets behind and supports police forces at all levels, hopefully we will see fewer police lives lost in the line of duty.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business is now expired. Pursuant to Standing Order 96(3), the order is dropped to the bottom of the list of the order of precedence on the Order Paper.

It being eight o'clock this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

The House adjourned at 8 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, June 10, 1993

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Charles A. Langlois (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and to Minister of National Defence): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 48 petitions.

[*Editor's Note: See today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

* * *

[*English*]

INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS

REPORT ON MEETING OF COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the report of my visit to the United Kingdom as the delegate from this House on the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Milliken: I do not know why there is any cause for merriment, Madam Speaker, I am presenting a report.

An hon. member: It is just that we like Peter.

Madam Deputy Speaker: I also like the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands, but I would like to hear what he is saying.

Mr. Milliken: It is always nice to hear my own voice, Madam Speaker, but I want to table the report.

I happened to be the only delegate that went from this Parliament to this meeting. Only one was invited. The lot fell to the Liberal Party this year and I was selected by my Whip and the members of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association to attend this meeting.

I may say that the trip was a most interesting and enjoyable experience. I had the opportunity to meet with representatives from 15 Commonwealth countries. Their names and positions are detailed in the report. I am pleased to table this report today in fulfilment of my obligations.

* * *

FINANCE

FIRST REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the first report of the Subcommittee on International Financial Institutions. It is also the 19th report of the Standing Committee on Finance.

This report deals with Canada's relations with the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank and calls for a full scale review of Canada's relations with those two institutions.

• (1010)

I would like to add my thanks to the members and research staff of the committee for their hard work in making this report possible.

[*Editor's Note: See today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

* * *

YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

Mr. Ken James (Sarnia—Lambton) moved for leave to introduce Bill C–453, an act to amend the Young Offenders Act and the Criminal Code in consequence thereof.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 68(2), the motion is deemed adopted.

Mr. James: Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce a private member's bill which will amend the Young Offenders Act and the Criminal Code in consequence thereof.

A good number of residents in my riding of Sarnia—Lambton, local law enforcement officials and members of the judiciary have expressed concerns and suggestions with respect to the Young Offenders Act.

In response the purpose of this bill is fourfold. First, it defines a young person as someone being between the ages of 10 and 16.

Second, it will instruct a judge to give primary consideration to the protection of society when considering a transfer to adult court for repeat young offenders and those charged with a violent offence.

Third, the bill will ensure that any young person who is found to experience a destructive home environment and who is convicted is directed to proper rehabilitation facilities.

Finally, it will make the criminal record of an offender available to the offender's school principal.

It is with great pleasure that I rise today to introduce these amendments on behalf of my constituents of Sarnia—Lambton.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Mr. James moves that the bill be now read the first time and printed.

Pursuant to Standing Order 69(1), the motion is deemed adopted.

Bill read the first time and printed.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CROWN PROPERTY LIENS ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-454, an act to make Crown land subject to provincial mechanics' or builders' liens legislation.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 68(2), the motion is deemed adopted.

[*English*]

Mr. Boudria: Madam Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to give subcontractors working on or supplying materials to federal Crown property the protection of provincial builders or mechanics lien legislation by allowing liens on federal Crown property and obliging the federal Crown to make the required hold-back of payments to the main contractor in order to ensure that subcontractors are paid.

Over recent years many subcontractors on federal government projects have been left holding the bag when main contractors have gone bankrupt. This is very unfortunate and I believe that small and medium-sized businesses in the construction area require this kind of protection.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Mr. Boudria moves that the bill be now read the first time and printed.

Pursuant to Standing Order 69(1), the motion is deemed adopted.

Bill read the first time and printed.

* * *

HAZARDOUS PRODUCTS ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

Mr. Rex Crawford (Kent) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-455, an act to amend the Hazardous Products Act.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 68(2), the motion is deemed adopted.

Mr. Crawford: Madam Speaker, I rise on behalf of two of my constituents, Maria and Robert Weese of Wallaceburg, Ontario, who tragically lost a son in an accident when a portable soccer net blew over.

This private member's bill is an act to amend the Hazardous Products Act and comes on the heels of the coroner's jury recommendations of the Wallaceburg case.

The bill would require that all soccer goals, hand ball goals and field hockey goals for recreational or school use be fixed to the ground. There are many other cases where nets have blown down and youngsters have been injured or even killed in both Canada and the United States.

• (1015)

I commend the Weese family for working to prevent other possible tragedies. I am proud and honoured as their member of Parliament to present this private member's bill today.

[*Translation*]

Madam Deputy Speaker: Mr. Crawford moves that the bill be now read the first time and printed.

Pursuant to Standing Order 69(1), the motion is deemed adopted.

Bill read the first time and printed.

* * *

[*English*]

PETITIONS

EDUCATION

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Madam Speaker, I have 19 petitions signed by people from the province of Ontario and from as far as the western and eastern parts of this country. These people want to establish Canada-wide standardized tests for students.

The people who have volunteered to gather these signatures were directed by Mrs. Cynthia Bled, an Ottawa Board of Education trustee. I want to thank them for all the work they have done.

The petitioners are concerned, as are many of us, with the fact that Canadian youth are leaving schools too quickly, that some 30 per cent do not finish secondary school and that 40 per cent of Canadians in 1993 have difficulties in reading and arithmetic.

If we want to compete in this international global economy we will have to be able to train our young people to better defend themselves and to learn and develop better skills.

These people are asking that national standards for testing in education be established across the country and I would like to endorse that.

SERIAL KILLER BOARD GAME

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Madam Speaker, it is my honour and privilege to present yet another series of petitions concerning the serial killer board game.

Today I am tabling 1,549 more signatures from across Canada asking the government to ban the importation of the serial killer board game.

The House will know that I have tabled to date petitions containing 46,695 signatures to ban this product. This is in addition to those tabled by many other members thus far.

I want to thank all Canadians and all members of Parliament who have helped in this exercise and who continue to do so. I continue to encourage Canadians to solicit signatures to ban the importation of this product into Canada.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Jack Whittaker (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt): Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to present a petition pursuant to Standing Order 36.

The people of my area of Okanagan Falls, Penticton, Kaleden, Oliver, Osoyoos, Greenwood, Grand Forks, Keremeos and Summerland are concerned about the affordability of telecommunications with the entry of Unitel and with the passage of the recent bill by the government.

The petitioners urge the government to consult with all affected parties, especially the rural residents who are at risk of having substantially increased costs for local telephone calls. That has already occurred in the province of British Columbia.

They urge the government to hold local hearings in the rural communities before deciding the fate of Canada's telephone system and pay attention to the direction given by the local people.

EDUCATION

Mr. Fred J. Mifflin (Bonavista—Trinity—Conception): Madam Speaker, I rise to present a petition certified by the clerk. The 25 petitioners are concerned that the $55 billion we spend on education and training be spent properly.

These petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to co-operate with the provinces and to establish a Canada-wide standardized test for students.

• (1020)

Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands): Madam Speaker, like the hon. member for Bonavista—Trinity—Conception and the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier I have a petition signed by numerous residents of Ottawa. They are also concerned about the expense governments in Canada incur in support of education.

They call upon the Parliament of Canada, in co-operation with the provinces, to establish standardized testing for students across our country so we can get better value for our education dollar.

Mr. George Proud (Hillsborough): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I rise to present a petition on behalf of students throughout the country.

They humbly beg Parliament, in co-operation with the provinces, to establish Canada-wide standardized tests.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. Jim Karpoff (Surrey North): Madam Speaker, I have the privilege to present two petitions this morning. One is signed by a number of residents in my riding of Surrey North in which they condemn the government's action of closing the immigration office and moving it to Vancouver.

They point out that it will mean poorer service in that people will have to travel into Vancouver. It also means the loss of jobs within the community. They ask the government to reverse its decision.

PHARMACEUTICALS

Mr. Jim Karpoff (Surrey North): Madam Speaker, the second petition is signed by a large number of people, mainly seniors who are concerned about the dramatic increase in drug prices since the government has basically wiped out the competitiveness of generic drugs.

They call upon the government to rescind both Bill C-91 and Bill C-22.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. Jesse Flis (Parkdale—High Park): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, some 32 constituents from Parkdale—High Park have asked me to table a petition in the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled.

The petitioners indicate that the Government of Canada has enacted legislation providing for two official languages, English and French, and the major political parties of Canada acted in concert in the aforesaid matters without consulting with or receiving a mandate from the people of Canada.

The petitioners call upon Parliament to enact legislation providing for a referendum of the people binding upon Parliament to accept or reject two official languages, English and French, for the government and the people of Canada, and the acceptance or rejection of the proposed amendments to be determined by a majority vote of the total votes cast in the whole of Canada, together with a majority vote in a majority of provinces with the territories being given the status of one province.

I know, Madam Speaker, you are looking at this petition with some disapproval, but as you know whether members of Parliament agree with petitions or not, they are bound to table them on behalf of their constituents.

CHILD CARE

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, in the first instance I have petitioners who ask the government to allow child care deductions from income where families have special needs children. This is particularly important for single parent families with special needs children. Very often these families have no choice but to use services and facilities which are extremely costly.

The petitioners feel that the current laws are unfair, insensitive, and can in fact be discriminatory. They ask the government to review the legislation.

EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, in the second instance I have petitioners who want child care facilities for workers who need such facilities. They want a reform of the unemployment insurance rules to ensure that there is no abuse of workers. They want the government to create situations favourable for jobs for the unemployed and for those who are on social assistance.

They would like the government to promote in-home jobs for mothers and fathers who want them. They want the government to consult the people in future budgets.

EDUCATION

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, finally I have a petition from petitioners who ask that there be standardized tests in Canada. They feel that this would be better for all Canadians.

There is an underlying question here or feeling that Canadians ought to be able to move from one area to another whatever their age level, whatever their credentials, and that those ought to be acceptable to other jurisdictions. That is a fundamental issue.

• (1025)

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley): Madam Speaker, my petition is like the one submitted by my friend from Parkdale—High Park. It is submitted by Mr. Kent Schubert and Vern and Doreen Lobb of Surrey. They avail themselves of the ancient undoubted right to present a petition to Parliament.

They point out that the Constitution officially makes Canada a bilingual country. They say the action of the government and the continuing action of political parties have disenfranchised the people of Canada on the subject of two official languages, English and French.

They ask that there be legislation providing for a referendum of the people binding upon Parliament to accept or reject two official languages, English and French, for the government and the people of Canada, and that the acceptance or rejection of the proposed amendments be determined by a majority vote of those total votes in the whole of Canada, together with a majority vote in a majority of the provinces with the territories being given the status of one province.

I am pleased to present it on behalf of my constituents.

PARKS CANADA

Hon. Alan Redway (Don Valley East): Madam Speaker, I am pleased this morning to present a petition on behalf of many people in the greater Toronto area including Newmarket, Toronto, Islington, Mississauga, Ajax, Scarborough, North York and East York, all of whom are petitioning this Parliament and this House in connection with the intention of the Canadian Parks Service to establish a proposed national historic park on Grosse Île.

The concern expressed in the petition is that perhaps in approaching this proposal Parks Canada is ignoring the fact that 15,000 Irish men, women and children fleeing famine in Ireland in 1847 are buried on Grosse Île in mass graves and the fact that through the generosity of the people of Quebec nearly 1,000 of the children orphaned that summer were adopted and allowed to keep their own names.

They call upon the Parliament of Canada to urge the government through Parks Canada to ensure that the Irish mass graves are perpetuated as the main theme of the historic park on Grosse Île as a permanent reminder of the Irish role in the building of Canada.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Charles A. Langlois (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and to Minister of National Defence): Madam Speaker, I ask that all questions be allowed stand.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

NORTHUMBERLAND STRAIT CROSSING ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-110, an act respecting the Northumberland Strait Crossing, as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee.

SPEAKER'S RULING

Madam Deputy Speaker: There are 65 motions in amendment on the Notice Paper for report stage of Bill C-110, an act respecting the Northumberland Strait Crossing.

[*English*]

Motions Nos. 1, 4, 7, 18, 21, 57, 60 and 63 standing in the name of the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie will be grouped for debate and a vote on Motion No. 1 will apply to Motions Nos. 4, 7, 18, 21, 57, 60 and 63.

Motions Nos. 2, 5, 8, 13, 16, 19, 22, 25, 28, 31, 34, 37, 40, 43, 46, 49, 52, 55, 58, 61 and 64 standing in the name of the hon. member for Skeena and Motions Nos. 3, 6, 9, 14, 17, 20, 23, 26, 29, 32, 35, 38, 41, 44, 47, 50, 53, 56, 59, 62 and 65 standing in the name of the hon. member for Yorkton—Melville are identical to Motions Nos. 1, 4, 7, 12, 15, 18, 21, 24, 27, 30, 33, 36, 39, 42, 45, 48, 51, 54, 57, 60 and 63 standing in the name of the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie.

• (1030)

After consultations those motions standing in the name of the hon. members for Yorkton—Melville and for Skeena will not be selected.

[*Translation*]

Motions Nos. 10 and 11, standing in the name of the hon. member for Ottawa West, are similar and, after consultation, Motion No. 10 will not be selected. Motion No. 11 will be grouped with Motion No. 12, standing in the name of the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie, for the purposes of debate, but these motions will be voted on as follows:

(a) if Motion No. 11 is agreed to, it will not be necessary to vote on Motion No. 12;

(b) if Motion No. 11 is negatived, it will be necessary to vote on Motion No. 12.

[*English*]

Motions Nos. 15, 24, 27, 36, 39, 42, 45, 46 and 51 standing in the name of the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie all seek to introduce new concepts and elements which go beyond the scope of the bill as agreed to at second reading. Therefore in accordance with Beauchesne's citation 698(1) these motions are out of order and will not be selected.

[*Translation*]

Motions Nos. 30, 33 and 54, standing in the name of the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie, will be grouped for debate and voted on as follows:

(a) if Motion No. 30 is agreed to, it will not be necessary to vote on Motions Nos. 33 and 54;

(b) if Motion No. 30 is negatived, it will be necessary to vote on Motion No. 33;

(c) if Motion No. 33 is agreed to, it will not be necessary to vote on Motion No. 54;

(d) if Motion No. 33 is negatived, it will be necessary to vote on Motion No. 54.

[*English*]

I shall now propose Motions Nos. 1, 4, 7, 18, 21, 57, 60 and 63 to the House.

MEASURE TO ENACT

Mr. Steve Butland (Sault Ste. Marie) moved:

Motion No. 1.

That Bill C-110 be amended by deleting Clause 1.

Motion No. 4.

That Bill C-110 be amended by deleting Clause 2.

Motion No. 7.

That Bill C-110 be amended by deleting Clause 3.

Motion No. 18.

That Bill C-110 be amended by deleting Clause 5.

Motion No. 21.

That Bill C-110 be amended by deleting Clause 6.

Motion No. 57.

That Bill C-110 be amended by deleting Clause 8.

Motion No. 60.

That Bill C-110 be amended by deleting Clause 9.

Motion No. 63.

That Bill C-110 be amended by deleting Clause 10.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to this whole host of amendments. I appreciate the assistance of the Clerk in putting the motions in appropriate groupings.

• (1035)

I do not think it takes a great deal of reasoning to figure out that in attempting to delete clause by clause each clause in this bill, we were trying to get the point across that we wanted to disembowel the whole bill if you will, to negate it in its entirety. Trying to speak to each one of those perhaps would be difficult, so I think the groupings are very appropriate.

At this time it allows us to put a general perspective on why we oppose the bill. Certainly this is a chronology of how not to get legislation through any legislative body, in this case the House of Commons. This is an experience in how not to do it. One could probably write a book on how it came to this point.

Now we are at the eleventh hour and the fifty-ninth minute. There will be time allocation and we will debate it on Monday and Tuesday. There are those who say: "Enough already; we have spoken to this bill. We have had public hearings for three years. Everything that has to be said has been said". In the words of Public Works, there are studies from the floor to the ceiling in the minister's office on the impact of the positives and negatives of this bill.

The bottom line is even though that has transpired and even though all of those studies are available and completed, the fact is there is still a pending court case and the ultimate environmental study has never been done. Even though all of that has transpired the opponents to the fixed link are saying: "Our questions have not yet been answered".

I think it behoves someone in this House to say: "Come on now, you know that the process was less than clean". I am not suggesting that the Minister of Public Works is fully responsible for what has come about here, but certainly it is a problem.

The whole fixed link project was not driven by anyone from any government. It was driven by a private developer saying: "Hey, would you not like to have a bridge or a tunnel? Do you not think that would be a great idea?"

I suppose many private developers are altruistic and they want to help the people of Canada. However, once in a while one does come down the line that perhaps is not so altruistic and does not want to build a billion dollar bridge just to help out the residents of P.E.I., New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and assist the tourism industry in Canada. We must at the least be suspicious of what is going on here.

Certainly we look at the process and the studies and our ice experts versus their ice experts. A study was done in 1988 when there was a very mild winter and a low ice condition. They said that was the wrong time to do the study. The Friends of the Island are saying to us: "Boy, if you were out there this year you would have seen the conditions on which studies should have been done", not at the low time but at the high time in order to get the full impact of what this bridge may do to the provinces involved.

There have been studies. One of the studies we questioned was a generic study on a generic crossing. Now they say: "Do an environmental assessment on this bridge, bridge *x* or bridge *y*, it does not really matter". Now there is a real bridge, there is a real proposal, but there has been no final ultimate study done environmentally as should have been done.

SCI, the proponent of the bridge, was asked to react to the Federal Court ruling that, no, the government did not follow the process properly, this final environmental review was not done. The government in its wisdom or lack thereof said that SCI had better react to this other study. So we are studying our own studies. Lo and behold, to the surprise of no one, the study that SCI did was acceptable.

• (1040)

If you are a proponent of anything and you study it, you are going to come out in favour of the particular proposal. There have been economic benefits studies. A government consulting agency hired and paid for by the federal government said it is not economically beneficial to Canada. It just does not fit. The numbers conflict. It is not acceptable. Another study was done which says it may in fact be economically viable.

No matter what study has been done economically or environmentally there is always another group saying that no, the figures are faulty, the environmental impact findings are faulty, it was done at the wrong time. Continual conflicting reports come forward.

Someone said that most of the Islanders want this. They had a vote on it. I think the vote was 60–some per cent to 30–some per cent but that was several years ago on this generic bridge. Does it not beg that we do not continually discuss this generic bridge?

At committee it was said that when the ice floe comes through it may hit one of the piers and put the bridge out of commission. That was absolutely right. It is a concern so what we are going to have to do is put bigger distances between the girders of the bridge. If they are spread out it will solve the problem.

Again it seems that this issue of the fixed link project has been addressed a little bit at a time. As a new wrinkle comes forward we are told it will be solved.

Something that has not yet been addressed, perhaps the provincial government of P.E.I. will address it on Monday, is the possibility of the bridge being out of commission. Constitutionally there must be a ferry in place to transport people. That should have been addressed in the very beginning.

We have continually brought forward solutions to problems as they crop up and here we are at the end of the process when it is still going to the court. I think it is important so I repeat that this is not how any legislation should go forward in this House. It is not a very clean process. It got out of hand. I understand that the government feels we are so far down the road, the private developer has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars and the government has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars, that it does not want to scrap the

project. It wants to put on the best face possible, even though it knows it is not quite right.

As a result we have this *mélange* and nobody is quite sure what the right answers are. They are not even sure of answers, let alone the right answers.

What we have tried to do is delete this thing. To finish, I want to say that the opponents have said if the government regulations are followed and the appropriate environmental review process does take place and the result is positive they will accept the decision. It is never too late.

I think the only problem we are dealing with now is the private developer saying if approval is not given, if we do not move on this very soon the whole deal is going to fall through. If the deal is as good as the proponent says it is for the people of Canada then let us do it, but let us do it right.

• (1045)

Mr. George Proud (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to my colleague from the New Democratic Party. In reading over the amendments the New Democrats have put forward it looks as if they want to totally stop this project.

For a few moments this morning I want to talk about a subject that is very close to the heart of Prince Edward Islanders and every Canadian, and that is transportation.

It has been said that the railways were a steel ribbon which held Canada together. While they have been allowed to wither and die in most parts of the country, other transportation problems and solutions have found their way to the forefront.

My own province, about which we speak today, came into Confederation on the promise of speedy and efficient communication with the rest of Canada. Believe me, there have been many times when Islanders, along with many other Atlantic Canadians, have thought long and hard about those commitments and how the federal government has chosen to fulfil them. We have fought long and hard, especially when we see transportation policies developed that seem to hurt our region while at the same time other facilities in other parts of the country are improved.

If I might be permitted, I would like to give hon. members a short history lesson about the transportation between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. In the early years after Confederation winter traffic and mail were transported by ice-boats, small open row-boats which were pushed, rowed and dragged across open water and ridges of ice and slush. Many tales of heroism and tragedy are told about the days of the ice-boats, but pressure from the government and people of Prince Edward Island led federal authorities to act gradually over a period of years to replace these ice-boats with a variety of ice-breaking ships.

This led through time to the massive ice-breakers that we have today which provide good service across the strait to the best of their ability. Even though the current Marine Atlantic fleet combines the best of modern technology there are many times in winter months when crossings are delayed at some length.

The first discussion of a fixed crossing began over 100 years ago with a proposal for the construction of a tunnel that would allow trains to move freely between Prince Edward Island and the rest of Canada. The discussion and debate on the tunnel project lasted for about 20 years. It gradually died out as the growth in usage of the automobile and the improvements in the capacities of the ferries signalled that a change was coming in transportation.

Even though each new improvement in the ferry service was hailed as the final solution it was soon found that better and more efficient service was needed and the call for improvements was renewed. The idea of a fixed crossing seemingly disappeared for 50 years, until the mid-1950s at which time plans were drawn for a causeway and then a bridge-causeway-tunnel combination. These plans were shelved in 1969. The idea lay dormant until the mid-1980s when the present round of fixed link discussions began.

Again there was an evolutionary process. The first proposal was for a tunnel that would transport automobiles and electrically operated trains. Eventually 12 different proposals came forward and were considered by the Department of Public Works.

The provision of a speedy and efficient transportation system has been at the forefront and will continue to be a dominant theme in the life of our province, as it has been in the life of our country. It is one that I hope we can resolve as concerned Canadians over the next few years.

While no solution is final we must always strive to do the best we possibly can based on what is available to us. The evolution of the transportation system between Prince Edward Island and the rest of Canada has been matched by the evolution of transportation across Canada and around the world.

While those hardy souls who braved the Northumberland Strait in the ice-boats would be amazed at the technology and the convenience of today's car ferries, we must remember that transportation elsewhere in the world has advanced to the same degree.

• (1050)

In the high-tech, competitive age in which we live we must be guaranteed convenient and easy access to the marketplace of the world or we will never ever be able to escape the economic doldrums in which we find ourselves. The process of resurrecting the idea of this fixed crossing has been brought here today.

At the risk of going over some very well-tilled ground I would like to share for a moment with this House some of the very detailed discussions and debate that have taken place over the past seven years and which have brought us to where we are today.

The Government of Prince Edward Island, following the federal Department of Public Works' decision to seek proposals for a fixed crossing, called a plebiscite in 1988. The campaign leading up to that plebiscite precipitated what can only be described as a passionate debate in Prince Edward Island which still rages in some quarters today. The vote was approximately 60 per cent to 40 per cent in favour. If there was a vote taken today the result would be in the vicinity of 70 per cent in favour.

After that plebiscite the original 12 proposals were pared down to seven and following more study, down to three. I am sure I need not remind members that a federal environmental review panel in 1990 rejected the so-called generic bridge proposal, stating that the risks were unacceptable. The environmental review panel had heard many social arguments as well as technical and scientific arguments concerning the link. Then an ice committee was formed by the federal government in 1991 to look specifically at the problem of ice and its retention in the strait by the bridge. That panel concluded that a bridge could be installed across the strait with no significant delay in ice-out time.

Following this report the federal minister asked for three proposals to go forward and through a rather lengthy process we have arrived at the situation we are at today. Strait Crossing Inc. of Calgary, Alberta has been designated as the firm that will build the crossing, but the debate still goes on in Prince Edward Island between the pro-link and anti-link forces. The economic, scientific and social aspects of the link are hotly debated. The claims and counterclaims sometimes become exaggerated. On occasion the debate can fall from the sublime to the ridiculous.

The issue of the fixed link was taken before the Federal Court and some comments were made in the judgment about the environmental review process. This round of meetings, as one of the demands of the judge was that a process be followed, was held as was specified and many people turned out. The province of Prince Edward Island has put forward an amendment to the Constitution in that legislature.

I personally feel the time has come to brush aside the rhetoric, the claims and the counterclaims and get on with the job. We must look at the whole project, not in terms of our own self-interest and petty and rather mundane fears but in light of the cold, hard facts that have been presented to us.

There have been over 90 studies done on this project over the years, and millions of dollars spent on them. I am personally committed to preserving the environment. We have said this all through the process. We believe that the studies have concluded that Premier Ghiz's 10 commandments, as they were called, have been met.

Of course there are other issues that have arisen, such as the ferry workers. Negotiations have to take place to see that these people are looked after, whether through transfers, early retirement or new job training. I believe that these things have been met and that we can go on and build this project. I believe that is the next logical step in the process of our transportation systems across this country.

I am very amused with the rhetoric concerning this project that has poured forth from my colleagues on the NDP benches. The citizens of Prince Edward Island and the rest of Atlantic Canada are not very happy with the criticism that has been levelled at our region by these instant experts who drop into our region from time to time, meet with a few people and their Atlantic supporters and then fly away again and make profound pronouncements from afar about our way of life, our

economy and our future. During their brief and not very well attended visits they develop a great expertise in our affairs and then pontificate at great length when they leave.

• (1055)

We do have our differences at home but we do resent being told how we do not deserve this development because we are too small and too insignificant in the great scheme of things.

Let us proceed with this project. We feel that all of the necessary commitments have been met and it is time to go on and see it through to fruition.

Mr. Dave Worthy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak today on report stage. The amendments that are in front of us, and there are a number of them, basically are just blocking amendments. They gut the bill. They delete these clauses clause by clause. Obviously they are meant as a symbol of opposition. They cannot be seriously debated because there is little meaning to them.

The hon. member representing the New Democratic Party was talking about some of the environmental issues and how we have to try to provide answers for the people. There are some people who, no matter what answers we provide or how many and how good they are, will never feel that they were enough. We know that. In society one can never answer all the questions people have, especially on an issue that does affect people emotionally.

I have talked to people on the Island and they are emotionally attached to one side of this issue or the other. Some of them want to keep their Island the way it is. Others want what I see as a bridge to prosperity and opportunity for the people of Prince Edward Island. In fact it is also a great opportunity for the people of New Brunswick and all of the maritimes.

As for the environmental issue, in the short time I have been dealing with this issue I have acquired two large brief-cases full of environmental information on the fixed link. I was perusing through some of it this morning in case we were going to be debating this issue for a while. I wanted to make sure I had the information for reference. There is study after study dealing with various stages of the environmental issues, and these are the smaller ones that I could put in a small brief-case. I did not want to order a taxi to get up to the House.

They all contain answers. They contain analyses and evaluations of these very important issues. The net result is that they are providing answers that the people in Prince Edward Island and Atlantic Canada, at least the vast majority of them, recognize and deal with the problems and concerns. The answers are sound and positive.

If we can satisfy the constitutional concerns, the continuing environmental concerns and the legitimate business concerns on the contract that has to be struck, then the vast majority of the people in Atlantic Canada at least want to see this project go ahead. I would argue very strenuously that the vast majority of people in Canada, if they understood the essence of this agreement, would also want this project to go ahead.

The previous speaker from Prince Edward Island knows the Island and this issue far better than I do. He knows that there is strong support, not only from Prince Edward Island but from New Brunswick as well. When the committee was meeting the current premier of New Brunswick and the former premier of Prince Edward Island appeared before it. I have a quote somewhere here but it is mixed up with all my environmental studies. That is the problem with overstudying.

• (1100)

Several of the members presently in the House today were at the meeting where testimony was given by both of those premiers, by the people leading the people of Atlantic Canada, that they believe in this project. They want to see this project go ahead. It is a real opportunity for the people on the Island and all Canadians.

I represent people from British Columbia. Some of them asked me: "How can you support this megaproject on Prince Edward Island?" I replied: "It is very simple. First, it is a major project for them but it is one that is unique".

I am hoping dearly that this is going to be successful. I believe it can show us the way for many other projects across the country.

In fact this project the people of Atlantic Canada have come up with is ingenious. It is going to be developed with money from private developers. It is not a government funded megaproject but it is going to have all the benefits of a megaproject. It is going to have the economic development spin-offs and people working in Atlantic Canada as if the federal coffers had been opened up and we were proceeding with a megaproject.

It goes beyond that. What we are putting into this is exactly what we would be putting into the existing ferry system over the next 35 years, no more, no less. At the end of that time we have a fixed link, a bridge turned back over to the government in operating order that will have probably more than half a century of use.

The tolls to the Islanders will be vastly reduced. The Islanders themselves estimate that over the next 35 years they will save over $250 million in tolls that they now pay. This is a major improvement for the people of Prince Edward Island. However all other Canadians, the people outside Prince Edward Island who are now having to subsidize and assist the Island because of the Confederation promise, will see the end of that subsidy.

I cannot say it any better than the premier of Prince Edward Island. She said in her speech yesterday: "When one takes into account the historical trends of toll rate increases at Marine Atlantic, the current fiscal realities of the federal government and the ever growing propensity to move to a user-fee philosophy, this change becomes a major achievement again on the part of the Islanders".

She says that using conservative assumptions—and I like her choice of the words conservative assumptions—on the toll it will result in a saving of $250 million to the Islanders in the payment of toll fees over the next 35 years. Subsequent to that the tolls on the bridge will be limited to the operational costs of the bridge.

She goes on to say, and I am pleased to quote this section: "I wish to commend the hon. Elmer MacKay for the leadership he has shown with respect to this project. He and his colleagues have done a tremendous service to the Canadian taxpayer. They have developed a long-term framework whereby they can meet their constitutional obligations without continued subsidization".

I would like to quote her closing remarks which say better than I ever could what this will mean to Atlantic Canadians: "In closing, in the Speech from the Throne there was reference made to the goal of economic self-reliance and self-determination for Prince Edward Island".

She goes on to say: "Transportation is an integral part of that equation. No longer will we be subjected to an intermittent transportation service. No longer will we be subjected to transportation uncertainties. No longer will we be subjected to divisive and protracted debate. No longer will we be subjected to unfettered toll increases. In tandem with Canada and SCI we are embarking upon self-determination and self-reliance in our transportation link to the mainland in a responsible and businesslike manner. The time for protracted debate is over. The time for action and decision is now".

• (1105)

Her message is to let the project proceed. I believe it is a good message for this House. The government and I appreciate the support and co-operation we have received not only from the Government of Prince Edward Island but also from the other governments of Atlantic Canada.

We look forward to proceeding through report stage and the successful conclusion of this project to establish the fixed link.

Mr. Pat Nowlan (Annapolis Valley—Hants): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to participate in this debate. I do so with all appreciation and sensitivity to my colleagues from Atlantic Canada.

I have to say in the frankness of Parliament there are many Atlantic Canadians, not just on the Island, not just friends on the Island, but Canadians in other parts of Atlantic Canada who do not favour the fixed link for a variety of reasons.

I want to declare my bias right at the start. I am philosophically against the fixed link, before getting into all the studies, before getting into the dollars and cents of this so-called contract out, build a bridge and 75 years down the road it has to be repaired. We talk about tolls. There are going to be tolls. That is my fundamental bias before getting into the facts and figures. That is where I am coming from.

I understand some of the debate going on, having good friends from P.E.I and there are members from P.E.I. in the House. No one will really know until if and when it is ever built how it is going to change the character of the Island.

As far as I am concerned—not being a native of the Island it may be a little easier for me to say—but I do resent some of the remarks made by the hon. member from Hillsborough whom I do respect. I do resent some of his remarks that members not from Atlantic Canada who raise questions in the House of Commons perhaps do not have the right to raise those questions. They have that right by the very fact that it is a bill before the House of Commons. It involves members from across the country and it involves the taxpayers of Canada.

One of the biggest shams of this bill is the business and charade that it is not going to cost the taxpayers any money. That is absolutely patently false. If the government had come clean on this public relations aspect of this bill many moons ago perhaps I would not feel quite as compelled to give another viewpoint from Atlantic Canada that it is not all peaches and cream in Atlantic Canada. I am not going to talk any more about the sociological aspects.

I used to practise law in British Columbia. I have a couple of children living there now. People may wonder why my friend from Cariboo—Chilcotin in British Columbia is pushing the fixed link, other than the fact that he is the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Public Works.

That member knows as anyone who lives in British Columbia knows, when you start to talk about the economics of links there is a lot more. This is coming from a person from Atlantic Canada where perhaps I might be criticized a little. However, there is a lot more economic sense in developing some of the plans to link the mainland of B.C. with Vancouver Island which is a high growth area of Canada than the sterile fixed link in an area that does not have as much growth.

I give full credit to the members who spoke from Hillsborough, Egmont and Cumberland—Colchester—a colleague of mine from Nova Scotia who has been doing a great job from his point of view—in making sure the fixed link comes forward and gets into the House and through the House into creation.

I point out to all those people, especially to my friend from Cariboo—Chilcotin who was not here at the time, that there is another sham around here. It is not just the sham in dollars that every taxpayer has the right to ask about. The member from Hillsborough should not complain that members have raised questions about the fixed link because taxpayers are involved.

• (1110)

There is a great shell game on the cost of the subsidy that is supposed to pay for the bridge. Even the studies the hon. member for Cariboo—Chilcotin mentioned show the big difference between the subsidy actually being paid out and the subsidy being computed to help Strait Crossing build the bridge, supposedly without any taxpayers' dollars.

Mention was made of the ferry workers and where they are going to fit into it. Well, we can talk about other aspects of this matter in terms of the fish stocks and the fish beds that are going to be affected but there is another sham here.

One of the times the matter of the fixed link was on the floor of the House and had a little flurry of activity was back in the sixties. There is a member from Moncton here whose mother was the member from Moncton and has a gold-plated shovel. Perhaps it is appropriate to have a shovel when talking about the fixed link. However she actually helped dig the foundation of the causeway around Moncton. All the studies up until that time had the causeway as the answer to join up P.E.I.

You can go to Moncton today. You can travel down there in the summertime. You can go over on the ferry. You might have to wait a while, but at least you have the character of an island. You will not get this Coney Island fixed link where people are going to build their substations and their offices on the mainland, scoot over to the island, do their little business and then scoot off.

Anne of Green Gables is going to become the ghost of Cavendish beach if this fixed link goes through. Even the Japanese will not be hoodwinked into visiting the character of the Island and staying a few days and making—

well, not making love, but in effect getting acquainted with Anne of Green Gables, and certainly getting excited by Lucy Maude Montgomery and her story. What are they going to do now? They are going to take their diesel buses we see outside the House of Commons and they are going to diesel onto the Island, shake hands with Anne of Green Gables and get off the Island before the sun goes down. That is what might happen.

There is a sham in the figures. There is a sham about politics. Perhaps I can understand the government's point of view to get the bill through. That is another thing. Perhaps in an election government candidates will say they are doing this and maybe other candidates too, but I just do not know if that is going to work.

What really bothers me about this whole aspect regardless of some of the rhetoric that I have used in these few minutes is that Canadian taxpayers have been inundated—look at poor Premier Bob Rae, look at any premier you want—with fiscal restraint. The thing about fiscal restraint is we are not supposed to have megaprojects.

In an interesting article in *The Financial Post* Diane Francis is starting to question equalization. I read it and I hope to get a letter off to Diane Francis because she certainly forgot a little history.

The Rowell–Sirois commission said that Atlantic Canada deserves equalization to help offset the high tariff policy that built up industry in Ontario. There was a fellow named C.D. Howe who killed the shipbuilding industry in Atlantic Canada and took it up the St. Lawrence River to the Saguenay because they were afraid of German U-boats. There are those types of things in history and Diane Francis did not really get into them.

My concern is with the good sincere Canadians, taxpayers all, from coast to coast who with equalization helped Atlantic Canada address some of its problems because it does not have the economic growth. Would they agree to look at a fixed link? I think this might be the last straw. In effect Canadians, all taxpayers who have good projects in their areas, are going to ask why we are building a billion dollar bridge which was not part of the study, as other members have said. To be frank, as far as I am concerned, if we are going to have a fixed link, build a tunnel. However, I do not know what the cost of that would be.

Mr. Speaker, I see you are giving me the high sign that I have one minute left. Seriously, as a federal member of Parliament, I sympathize with my colleagues from P.E.I. as members of Parliament. I understand the division on the Island.

However, I am very concerned in this time of fiscal restraint that taxpayers are going to wonder about the credibility of a government that goes ahead with this type of project. All over the land they see local projects not as big as a billion dollar bridge, but other projects be they in the cities or the country, be they day care or helicopters, and they wonder: How can a government go ahead after all the talk about a fixed link from Confederation on and at this time build a fixed link?

• (1115)

That will have implications for Atlantic Canada which makes it important for Atlantic Canadians to know about some of the shams in this bill.

Mr. Langlois: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I move:

That the debate be now adjourned.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): I declare the motion carried.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C–126, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Young Offenders Act, as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee.

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): There are three motions in amendment at the report stage of Bill C–126, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Young Offenders Act.

[*Translation*]

Motion No. 1, standing in the name of the hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby, although presented as clause 2, clearly takes the form of a preamble, even using the same wording as a preamble. Paragraph 705 of the sixth edition of Beauchesne states that it is not permissible to add a preamble to a bill by way of amendment. I must therefore declare Motion No. 1 inadmissible.

[*English*]

Motion No. 2, standing in the name of the hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby, will be debated and voted upon separately.

[*Translation*]

Motion No. 3, standing in the name of the hon. member for Moncton, will be debated and voted on separately.

[*English*]

I shall now propose Motion No. 2 to the House.

MEASURE TO AMEND

Ms. Clancy: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. When you come to Motion No. 3 in the name of the hon. member for Moncton, I understand there is unanimous consent to allow me to move that amendment in his absence.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is there unanimous consent for the hon. member for Halifax to move the amendment when we come to Motion No. 3?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Ms. Dawn Black (New Westminster—Burnaby) moved:

Motion No. 2.

That Bill C-126 be amended in Clause 2 by adding immediately after line 25 on page 3 the following:

"(2.1) Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, no person engaging in the conduct outlined in subsection (2) shall be deemed to have been acting without lawful authority if the conduct occurred at or outside a workplace during a labour dispute."

She said: Mr. Speaker, during the clause-by-clause debate on this bill there was some discussion around removing legitimate labour disputes from this bill. I am pleased to have an opportunity to discuss this once again in the House as I reworded the amendment.

When the witnesses appeared at the legislative committee on Bill C-126, many of them recommended that legitimate labour disputes be exempted from this bill. The Government of Ontario, the Canadian Labour Congress, the National Union of Public and General Employees, the Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women, the National Action Committee on the Status of Women, METRAC, the National Association of Women and the Law, the Criminal Lawyers' Association and the Canadian Bar Association stated that the provision was too broad and could potentially apply to labour disputes.

My colleague from Mission—Coquitlam found the Library of Parliament's research branch had issued a paper arguing that the bill as presently drafted could very possibly be used in labour disputes.

There are examples of how particular actions can be excluded from a bill of this kind. In New Jersey, California and other American jurisdictions anti-stalking laws specifically exempt legitimate labour disputes. We must remember that there is already legislation on the books to deal with intimidation, threats or violence that may occur during a labour dispute. These provisions already exist.

• (1120)

In the absence of any statement within this new law of what its purpose is, I am concerned that in legitimate labour disputes, in some jurisdictions, authorities may attempt to use this law to intimidate those engaged in what is legal activity.

I proposed a similar amendment at the legislative committee but unfortunately it was voted down. I sincerely hope that since members of this House have had time to reflect on the importance of this amendment, they will see fit to support it this time.

Mr. Rob Nicholson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister of State (Agriculture)): Mr. Speaker, I have not changed my mind about the appropriateness of having this in the bill. I would ask the House to turn down the suggestion and vote against the motion as proposed by the hon. member.

If we look closely at the wording, it says among other things that "no person shall be deemed to have been acting without lawful authority if the conduct occurred at or outside a work place during a labour dispute". It would have the effect of completely removing any labour

dispute from the criminal harassment sections. I think that would go too far. Even though for the most part union activity is lawful and conducted according to provincial laws, I do not think Canadians would want a blanket exemption.

It would mean that no matter how much a person was harassed and had reasonable cause to fear for his safety during a labour dispute he would be unable to avail himself of the criminal harassment provisions. I should point out that not all labour dispute activity is lawful. This amendment would make a violent, illegal strike into a lawful labour dispute activity.

I think it goes too far. I can think of all kinds of different areas of activity in Canada that would have as much claim to an exemption as this. I do not think most Canadians would like to make an exception to the criminal harassment provisions no matter how much they believe in union activity and the rights of unions to strike and picket.

Ms. Joy Langan (Mission—Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my colleague, the hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby. I congratulate her on her private member's bill which led the government to finally open its eyes and realize how desperately we need this kind of legislation in Canada to protect women from fear. It will also protect women from well-founded fear of violence when they have been stalked. Until now they have really had no recourse and have never been taken seriously by this Parliament, the law, law enforcers and the community.

I very much support this bill. I want to make that absolutely clear. As a woman in Canadian society I resent being afraid. I resent having to change my activities. As a woman in public life I resent having to be even more concerned about ensuring that I take precautions to walk, move and live in this country in a safe way. I resent the fact that I, or any woman in this country should be in a position where we often feel fearful, look over our shoulders and wonder just what is going on in terms of whether someone is unduly watching, following or stalking, under the definition in this bill.

I want to speak today about this amendment. I refer to the comments made by my colleague opposite, the previous speaker, who said he had concerns about this amendment so he has changed his mind about it. The member might want to look at the original amendment given in committee by the hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby that the government voted against in committee. It was not as broad as this amendment but this amendment had to be worded more broadly to have it accepted by the House as an amendment today.

• (1125)

The hon. member talked about the fact that he did not want to see a wide open situation created where violent illegal strikes would be given a blank cheque. Right now we have a situation where non-violent legal strikes are forced into becoming violent legal strikes through lack of support and protection for those on the picket line. Therefore, I think it is stretching the imagination and certainly catering to those who would like to see no rights for trade unions and workers on the picket line to say this kind of an amendment would create a situation where violent, illegal strikes could take place.

There is already legislation on the books that outlines and determines the legality of picketing and what is legal or illegal on the picket line. Let us take one tiny step beyond the legalities and niceties and talk about how this bill, which is designed to protect women and everyone in this country from stalkers, can be used against workers when they take legal economic action against their employers.

I have been told on a number of occasions and certainly we have been told in the Library of Parliament document and the research that was done for us there is a good possibility that this bill could be interpreted and used as a threat over the heads of those on legal picket lines. Many people have told me that a Crown attorney would never proceed with charges regarding a picket line under this bill but I am not talking about charging people. I am talking about using this bill to threaten and intimidate people on legal picket lines. I am talking about being charged by an RCMP officer or a city police officer while on a picket line.

Quite possibly the Crown attorney would never proceed with the charges, but using this bill, making those threats on the picket line and even charging people on the picket line create fear and a situation where people who are going about very legal business in this country under the law can be intimidated into abandoning their very legal picketing.

We are talking about threats here. We are talking about a bill where we are trying to eliminate threats to Canadians and situations where Canadians are threatened. We refuse to look at other jurisdictions that already have this bill and have experienced the results and benefits of this kind of bill.

In the United States numerous states have exempted trade unions from this bill and it is not a country that has the kind of respect for the labour movement we have here. We are talking about trade unions going about the legal business of picketing in a legal dispute. We are not giving a blank cheque for people to run amok here. We are talking about legal picketing. It is the right of all workers in this country to withdraw their labour and not have a bill like this hanging over their heads intimidating them so they will abandon their right to strike or picket.

I urge this House to really think about what it is doing. The government is introducing a law in the dying hours of this Parliament, unfortunately without the kind of discussion with Canadians and particularly women we would have liked to have had.

It is a law we need and a law we all believe we need, but by giving rights and protection for the common good of Canadians we are insidiously creating a threat to a very large group of people in this country. One-third of Canadian workers are organized and we are taking away the right for them to go about their legal business as trade unionists and use their legal rights for their own economic benefit and pursue collective agreements.

• (1130)

I urge members opposite to once again consider the amendment put forward by the hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby and approve this amendment.

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a brief remark on this.

I begin by commending everyone who has been involved in developing this legislation, particularly the member for New Westminster—Burnaby who initiated this process through a private member's bill. Many citizens, some of them in my riding, initiated this process by lobbying me as a member of Parliament and other members of Parliament and levels of government to do something about the vulnerability of women in particular to stalkers.

We have had a severe problem in Winnipeg in the last little while with this and a number of women have been killed by stalkers. The people of Winnipeg know only too well the urgency of the legislation we have before us.

It is nice to see that sometimes Parliament can act with a certain amount of expediency. I hope the government will see fit to accept the amendment that has been moved in order to make it clear that this bill cannot be used for purposes of intimidation in labour disputes. I think the Criminal Code deals adequately with those possibilities in other ways.

Even if that is not the case, it is still well and good that we should pass this legislation. It is an improvement on what we have. I think particularly of a woman in my riding, Mrs. Jensen, whose daughter was killed by her boyfriend after she had been harassed for quite a while. I know she will be happy today to see that the political process does work and that we are able to pass this kind of legislation. I hope it will prevent those kinds of tragedies in the future.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): In my opinion the nays have it.

Some hon. members: On division.

Motion No. 2 negatived.

Ms. Mary Clancy (for Mr. Rideout) moved:

Motion No. 3.

That Bill C–126 be amended by adding immediately after line 16 at page 13 the following:

REVIEW OF ACT

"19. (1) A comprehensive review of the provisions of this Act shall be undertaken by December 31, 1998, by such committee of the House of Commons as may be designated or established by the House for that purpose.

(2) The committee referred to in subsection (1) shall, within a year after the review is undertaken or within such further time as the House of Commons may authorize, submit a report on the review to the House including a statement of any changes the committee recommends."

She said: Mr. Speaker, this amendment builds into the legislation a five–year review clause.

I want to congratulate my colleague, the hon. member for Moncton, for his private member's bill in this area and also for bringing forward this amendment. The reason for this, among other things, is the concern about the lack of consultation.

I would like at this point to commend the work done in the legislative committee by the chair, by the parliamentary secretary, by the NDP status of women critic. All members worked together to try to create the best bill we could in this area. I think one thing we may have forgotten at the committee stage was the possibility of a five–year review.

This is not an unprecedented move in this House. There have been review clauses in other bills. I am thinking of the legislation on prostitution on the civil side. The Employment Equity Act was subject to a five–year review.

I have been asked why five years when certain other bills have had three years or thereabouts as a review. The reason for the five years in this particular case was the probable necessity for a case on this matter to filter its way through to the highest court in the land. Five years seemed a reasonable compromise in that case.

• (1135)

I merely suggest that this might be something that could give us an opportunity to redress some of the ill feeling arising from the lack of consultation. I would ask for the support of the House on this amendment.

Ms. Dawn Black (New Westminster—Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of this motion, which calls for a statutory review of the bill.

There is the potential that five years down the road we will see some difficulties with the bill because of the way it is worded or the way that the wording is interpreted. In fact one of the government amendments that added to the bill the words "in all the circumstances" I am concerned may serve only to confuse the issue rather than clarify it. The amendment that is proposed would give us the opportunity to correct the legislation as we watch how it is interpreted by the courts.

I hope that whatever government is in power at the time would then engage in a full consultation rather than the process we have gone through here in trying to rush the bill through within a few days, and actually rush amendments through within a few short hours.

I am concerned that down the road we may have women coming to us saying that the bill is not as effective as it could be because of the way it has been interpreted or the lack of enforcement around the bill. We may be told that because criminal harassment is a hybrid offence, because of the way the bill is currently worded with no minimum penalties for repeated offences, that the men who are harassing these women are still stalking them because all these offenders received was probation or a small fine. I am concerned that more women may die.

Down the road we may have the labour movement coming to us with examples of where this legislation was misused to intimidate those who are engaged in legitimate labour disputes. It is clear that the government is not willing to move on some of the more serious flaws that some of us have identified in the bill.

For instance, it moved on the question of intent but not in the way recommended by the Government of Manitoba. The wording of the Government of Manitoba on this was explicit and very clear. It would have made it a crime to engage in harassing conduct which causes another person to reasonably fear for their safety.

This would be a crime of general intent where one must address the issue of intending to engage in the conduct. It is simpler and more direct than adding the test of knowing the other person is harassed or proving recklessness.

In a rather typical case which took place in Toronto, a woman was harassed by an ex–boyfriend for six months. She would stop at a restaurant, he would walk in and sit at the next table. She would go shopping, he would be lurking around. She would try to sleep at night and he would be banging on her doors and windows in a rage. She found notes on her car, on utility poles, on bus

shelters from him wanting her to take him back. He thought that he had the right to control her.

The police for a very long time did not take this behaviour seriously. Everything he did was well within a defence that he did not intend to harass her. He could say he did not know he was harassing her. He did not know of the risks that he would be harassing her. All he wanted to do was to express his love, so he could get back with her.

If that mental element cannot be proven, he can be acquitted even though her life and movements have been seriously curtailed by his controlling her and her fear for her safety. The problem is engaging in conduct that causes another person to fear for their safety. Proving the attention to engage in the contact should be the issue rather than proving knowledge that the other person feels harassed.

The government addressed the concerns about reasonable fear by adding to the bill "in all the circumstances" but I do not believe that this makes the bill clearer at all.

The committee stage of this bill was a rush process. It was pushed through in undue haste. The whole process of clause by clause was only a few hours.

Most of my amendments were defeated, including one to provide minimum penalties for repeat offenders and an exemption for labour disputes which was turned down again today. I proposed other amendments that were recommended by women's organizations, by provincial governments, such as the removal of the word "reasonable" and the addition of "lawful authority or purpose".

• (1140)

As well, I proposed an amendment to the child witness portion. The bill reads that "if so ordered a child and a support person cannot communicate with each other during testimony". If a very frightened five-year old child who has been sexually assaulted and is now in a court room surrounded by strangers in a very intimidating area, turns to the support person and says: "I am scared. I want to go home", this might give the defence counsel grounds to throw out the case.

The problem is not the child communicating with the support person or the support person nodding or passing a Kleenex. That is not the problem. What the bill is trying to get at, and what my amendment clarified, is that the support person should not communicate with the child in order to lead the testimony.

I am glad that in response to one of my amendments the government withdrew clause 7 of its bill on spousal conspiracy. More efforts need to be put into educating the judiciary about violence and control in spousal relationships to ensure that abused women are not revictimized by charges of conspiracy.

However I was generally disappointed that this bill was brought forward so late and that we did not have the time to review it very thoroughly to ensure that what we are doing is what we really want to do as parliamentarians.

Otto Von Bismarck once said that if you like sausages or if you like laws, do not watch either being made. I think that is quite appropriate in this case.

The consultation on the child protection portions of the bill was deemed to be adequate by child advocates. There was contact with the concerned organizations over many years and the justice committee has been reviewing the implementation of Bill C-15 which addresses some similar issues.

The consultation around the stalking portion unfortunately was very minimal and inadequate and I believe we have the potential to see problems arise because of it.

I hope that all members will support this amendment to review the bill after five years. I think it is important. It will give parliamentarians and the public at large a mandated opportunity to examine how the bill has been interpreted.

Mr. Rob Nicholson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister of State (Agriculture)): Mr. Speaker, let me give a couple of comments with respect to the whole process by which this bill is before Parliament.

It has been my experience with all the changes we have made to the Criminal Code, that among other criticisms directed at us, we are told that either we are too slow in bringing in the legislation or we are rushing the legislation. It is usually one or the other.

I do not apologize for either the timing or the number of bills before this Parliament. If we look at the five years of the 34th Parliament I would be surprised, and I think I am correct in saying this, there has not been one month that this House has not been seized with justice legislation, all of it designed to make this country a better and safer place in which to live, all of it I believe bringing much needed improvement to the criminal justice process. So I do not apologize for it at all. I am very pleased and honoured to have been part of it.

With respect to the present bill I am delighted that Parliament is seized with this issue. Not less than a month ago I presented a petition from 6,400 individuals, mainly from the city of Niagara Falls but throughout the Niagara peninsula, calling upon Parliament to bring in anti-stalking legislation.

Hon. members can say: "You should have waited. You should have postponed this to the fall. You should have conducted the committee hearings this summer. You should have done a lot of things". I can say from my point of view I am delighted that we are here, that we are doing this, that Parliament is discussing it this afternoon. This is a good improvement to the law. It builds upon this government's commitment to do something about violence directed against women and children.

• (1145)

I mention children. Quite frankly the provisions that allow us for the first time to ban convicted child molesters from hanging around parks and from participating in voluntary organizations like the Boy Scouts and Big Brothers were not mentioned enough during the committee process. Convicted child molesters can now be banned from participating in those organizations. I think that is great.

This is in combination with the child pornography bill that is also before Parliament. I hope and pray that can get through Parliament as well. This month of June 1993 is a bad month for child molesters in Canada. I am very proud and very determined and make no apologies to anyone for the course we are on.

With respect to the amendment the hon. member mentioned, I can appreciate that every piece of legislation as proposed at the committee stage will be reviewed in three or five years. I wonder whether it is necessary on two counts.

I believe the Access to Information Act was mentioned by one hon. member. It was a completely new change to the parliamentary system. I can see the logic of building in a three or five-year review process. With respect to the child abuse sections it was a fundamental change as to the way we treat children in our criminal justice system, and there was a review process of that.

This legislation builds on what we have already done. The provisions with respect to children and the rules with respect to cross-examination build on Bill C-15. The provisions with respect to sexual harassment are an extension of the intimidation sections in the Criminal Code. For the most part this is not unique. This is not a break with the past. This is building on what we already have.

I have another concern with respect to this matter. I do not think we should have to wait five years or six years to do this type of thing. The Department of Justice monitors all the changes made by Parliament. It monitors them on a continuing basis.

For instance, when the Young Offenders Act came into effect in 1984 we did not wait five years to change it. I remember the minister bringing in amendments concerning fleeing young people and being able to publicize their names and faces for the first time. We did not wait for a five-year review of the Young Offenders Act. He brought it forth in 1985.

We did not wait another five years before we got into the business of changing quite substantially the test of whether a young person who has committed violent or dangerous crime should be moved to an adult court. I mean we were not tied into it.

I can see what would happen with this legislation. If in three or four years we start thinking that perhaps there were some modifications we would make, the argument we will be met with will be that a parliamentary committee will be looking at it within the year. It has another year to report and then Parliament might be seized with it. That would act as an impediment. That may slow down the process. In the example I gave with respect to the Young Offenders Act there was no waiting five years if we believed there was a flaw.

I can tell the House that the department and all parliamentarians will watch very closely how this piece of legislation works. I do not think there should be any impediment, moral, legal or otherwise, to our changing it again. We have changed it. As I said we have changed the

Criminal Code many times since we have become the government. I think all the changes were in the right direction. We were not tied into a process whereby we were waiting five years and then one year for the parliamentary committee to report and then having the government seized with making changes.

I would ask the House to turn this amendment down.

Mr. Pat Nowlan (Annapolis Valley—Hants): Mr. Speaker, I will just make a very short comment on this amendment because I think a couple of other members want to speak.

I know the parliamentary secretary wants to move the matter along. Quite frankly I may surprise the parliamentary secretary because my objection to the amendment really was the five-year period. I have the greatest respect for the member for Halifax who moved the amendment for the member for Moncton.

I was involved in legislation when I sat on the other side where there were review procedures under the National Transportation Act. I think it was three years. I was bothered by the five-year period. I listened quite seriously to the parliamentary secretary. I frankly think he makes a good case.

• (1150)

It is a new bill. I commend the member from Westminster who the member for Winnipeg Transcona mentioned. I was here when she introduced her private member's bill. I have concern as other members have mentioned—she certainly did in her thoughtful speech—about this legislation because there were some serious issues involved in it.

Other interest groups outside the House have raised serious questions but I tend to agree with the parliamentary secretary. We know there is an issue. All members want to try to resolve this horror of stalking people, basically women. I am not talking about children; they are stalked too.

There is not a member in the House who has not had some constituent in that type of situation. There is no doubt about it. We cannot get away from it. We try to equalize everything. There is emancipation of men and women. The fact of the matter is that with the law of the land and the way women are treated unfortunately by some men they are still at a very real disadvantage in many ways.

Will the bill meet all the problems? Obviously there will still be some horrors occurring in our streets, towns and cities, but at least the bill is trying to address the problem.

I do feel a five-year review could very well be an impediment. I would hope the new government after the next election will be watching this matter. I do not think we will wait for the Supreme Court of Canada to decide five years down the road that it is an interesting time to review it. I tend to share the views of the parliamentary secretary.

Just briefly on the Young Offenders Act which is also included in the bill, I tell the House I have just had a questionnaire returned. The number of replies absolutely boggled my mind. I have sent out a few questionnaires in my term as a member. Never before have I had more returned and signed with the comment page filled with substance.

Some people do not think these questionnaires are even read. Other than members' pensions which get a real response from members, some of whom have tried to address it, one thing that surprised me was the reaction of the public on the need to reform the Young Offenders Act. I appreciate what the parliamentary secretary said. I was here when the Young Offenders Act came in. I was here in 1985 when the amendments came in.

In view of the horrors with young offenders and because of protection under that law, I am afraid the new Parliament better not wait for a year or two years but it better address the issue. It really has had a lot of response, certainly from my constituents. It is one of the consistent themes in the over 2,000 questionnaires I have received back.

Some may wonder about 2,000 questionnaires. I do not know how much experience some members have had, but I remember Pierre Elliott Trudeau in his heyday in 1968 sent out a questionnaire to his riding of Mount Royal of 50,000-plus and he received 760 back. He thought that was great. In my history, other than having sent out the last one, we get about 1,000 back. Just three years ago they did not even sign. There is always a little hook to get a constituent to sign so they can perhaps go

on a mailing list. What really impressed me was that over two-thirds signed and made substantive comments.

In conclusion the parliamentary secretary has a good point on the five-year period. That is way too long. I hope it will weigh on the conscience of a new government to make sure it happens even quicker to meet the exigencies of the situation. The new Parliament had better address the Young Offenders Act because that is a scar on the conscience of society that has to be met.

Hon. Alan Redway (Don Valley East): Mr. Speaker, I rise to indicate once again my strong support for the bill and to address the issue of a review.

It is ironic that the government party, my own party, has for some time, particularly when we were on the other side of the House, advocated reviews of legislation and sunset clauses in legislation.

• (1155)

At the same time our party in government has in fact instituted in some cases reviews after a period of time. I think particularly of the employment equity legislation which has provisions in it for a review, first of all after five years and subsequently a review every three years after that.

I had the honour and the privilege of chairing the review committee on the Employment Equity Act after five years. It was set up in accordance with the legislation which had a review provision that it was to be reviewed in five years. It was set up over a year ago. The committee brought in a review report in a relatively short period of time. It was set up in November 1991. It brought in its report in early May 1992. We have yet to receive a response from the government with respect to that review.

This points out the difficulties that we face when we do have these review provisions. I share the concerns of opposition members that we should have a review provision. However, I think as the parliamentary secretary has pointed out, even where we have reviews we know that there are difficulties actually implementing recommendations that the review has put before the government. There are instances though where the government has acted well before a five-year period to bring in amendments that do make sense and that are very effective.

I am not quite sure, based on my experience here with this question of a review, whether we are any further ahead to put it in legislation or not. I think that if a review makes sense then it is going to happen. If it is just in there for the sake of having a review, as we have seen with the employment equity legislation, it can go on forever and we do not get any resolution in any event.

Mr. Ross Harvey (Edmonton East): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of the amendment proposed today by the hon. member for Halifax. In doing so I wish to note at the outset that I, as do the rest of my colleagues in the New Democratic Party caucus, support the bill itself. We are seeking here merely to provide for its eventual improvement.

The thing that must be borne in mind as we consider the merits of this amendment is that with this bill we are embarking on very fresh territory in Canadian law. We are moving into areas of conduct, behaviour and pathology that we have never before entered into through the Criminal Code. This being the case, prudence dictates that we monitor closely, and at some fixed time review the operations of the act. To fail to do so would be to abandon a responsibility that is placed on us precisely because this is so new an element in Canadian law.

I do not believe that any prudent government would allow the operation of this law without close scrutiny and indeed a formal review at some point following the coming into force of the law. However I must say that the current government has engaged in many activities that I would have thought no sane government would do.

To say that we should at this point sort of accept the fact that it is understood that this is a brand new departure and that in consequence we may simply rely on the government in its own good time and in its own good fashion, to undertake whatever review is necessary is a pleasant thought, but it is not one with which I am wholly comfortable. Rather I would suggest, as this amendment proposes, that we retain in this House the authority and the ability five years hence to undertake our own review of the operations of this bill.

Again I would suggest that simple prudence dictates this, especially given the questions and concerns that are still out among sections of the public regarding the bill. I think for example of the amendment proposed today by the hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby concerning labour disputes which has been defeated in this House. That concern is still there.

• (1200)

I think, as well, of the concerns that have been publicly and forcefully expressed by the National Action Committee on the Status of Women concerning the nature of the apprehension a woman must have under the current provisions of the bill.

Over time these concerns may prove warranted but we will not know that. We will not have any formal mechanism in place to review those questions and come to those conclusions in the absence of the amendment proposed here today.

I bear in mind that, although it is true this bill had all-party support in committee, it went through clause-by-clause study of this radically new departure in three hours. I know my colleague, the hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby, proposed six amendments some of which were accepted. There was a raft of government amendments. But in three hours they tore through the bill in committee.

It may be that that is necessary. It may be that such times are required to get the bill through the House before we adjourn next week. If that is required, so be it.

However, even allowing that that haste is required, again I say that prudence dictates a fixed review. I commend the idea to the members of this House. Do not abandon that potentially extremely useful tool.

A review in five years will harm no one. It will cost comparatively little if anything and will give us a safeguard that any prudent House would wish to set in place.

Having said that let me conclude by saying that we wish Godspeed to this bill. We look forward to its coming into force as rapidly as possible because we know there is a stalking problem out there.

I do not believe there is a community in this country that has been left untouched by the terrible tragedy of women being murdered because they had the ill fortune at some point to be associated with an unbalanced, pathological male.

I know in my community this has happened more than once in and around the city of Edmonton. The most recent case that springs to mind included circumstances where the woman was being stalked and her family went to the police and said: "This is happening. We need help". That help was not forthcoming.

It is hoped under this act that help will come. Nothing we do here can bring back to life those women who have been murdered in our communities. However it is hoped that what we do here today will prevent such murders in future.

We commend to the House this amendment. It is certainly our intention regardless to support the bill.

Mr. Nicholson: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think you might find unanimous consent of the House that at the conclusion of report stage the House proceed directly into the third reading stage of this bill.

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I want to compliment the parliamentary secretary for having had some discussions beforehand. Certainly this did not catch this member by surprise.

This is the way a good many bills can be dealt with especially when there is such a need to fill a very obvious gap in our jurisprudence with all the problems that have been mentioned about whether in the hurry to do this before we break all those issues have been addressed.

However the reason I speak is that I commend the parliamentary secretary for doing it this way. I totally resent again the government House leader imposing Standing Order 78(1) during report stage and then moving to complete report stage and third reading all at once.

I know this is not the time to discuss that but I just want to compliment the parliamentary secretary. This is the way bills can move rather than using that tremendous gag of time allocation which makes a travesty of this place.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is there unanimous consent to debate third reading after the concurrence motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

• (1205)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): The question is on Motion No. 3. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Some hon. members: On division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Negatived on division.

Motion No. 3 negatived.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gilles Loiselle (for the Minister of Justice, Attorney General of Canada and Minister of State (Agriculture)) moved that the bill, as amended, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

[*English*]

Mr. Loiselle (for the Minister of Justice) moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Rob Nicholson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister of State (Agriculture)): Mr. Speaker, I suppose that anytime there is an amendment to the Criminal Code and I have the honour to speak in the House then I would say it is a pleasure to speak. It truly is a pleasure to talk at the third reading stage of this bill.

I begin by thanking hon. members on all sides of the House for making it possible for this bill to get to third reading because I do believe that it is an important step forward in the Criminal Code. It is an important step forward for individuals who fear for their lives and their safety because of the unwanted attention that is sometimes directed at them.

I am pleased that the members of this House have agreed to move this piece of legislation. This is legislation that I think is very helpful and very important to children involved with the criminal justice system and children who are the victims of child molesters. There is considerable reason for this House and its members to be proud of the work they have done on this legislation.

A number of individuals and groups came before the legislative committee and indicated that they wished there were more time for consent. I would be less than honest if I said that I wished there were more time for consent. I can say that we are not bringing this legislation forward to be miserable or not to have a full discussion on this. There are certain realities we face. Among all the things and the pressures facing the minister, the government and parliamentarians, the process has been a reasonable one.

It was just three months ago that I was in Toronto and participated in various workshops concerning the prevention of crime. I can say that there were individuals there and I am sorry I did not take down their names and with what they were affiliated. However, they raised the matter of an anti-stalking legislation and indicated the things that we could be doing at the federal level to enhance public safety and to make better laws in this country. Certainly anti-stalking was one of them.

I mentioned at the report stage that I was the recipient of a petition in my own riding of Niagara Falls in which over 6,000 people, mainly women, said: "Look, this is an urgent problem. Parliament should bring forward legislation in this area".

I wish there had been lots of time for the parliamentary committee to study this. It was done in a couple of weeks. I do not agree that the clause-by-clause consideration was only three hours. I remember being there for most of the afternoon. We went from 3.30 p.m to about 6 p.m. and then we went again for several hours in the evening. I can say that I and other members were prepared to come back the following morning as well if there had been other amendments or other discussions.

Ms. Langan: It was only three hours for clause by clause.

Mr. Nicholson: Three hours? My own recollection of it is that we were there in the afternoon and the evening. If hon. members want to discuss it further, I wish we had the summer. I wish we could bring in people and everything else.

• (1210)

Having said that, I think this is good legislation. I believe it was well crafted and the committee process was a good one. I respectfully disagree with individuals

who were before the legislative committee and threw up their hands and said they did not like what we were doing because they were not consulted.

Part of the consultation process is the legislative committees. Those who are backbenchers sometimes make speeches in which we say we want more involvement and influence. I truly believe the legislative committee process is a way of consulting people who are directly involved and have an interest in legislation and I think it can make a difference.

I have been on all the legislative committees in the justice area for the last nine years. I can think of only one or two pieces of legislation that were not changed at the committee stage. I think that is the way it should work. Whether a suggestion comes from a member of the government, a member of the NDP or the Liberals, I think we as committee members have a responsibility apart from any partisan considerations to have a look at it to see whether we can incorporate it.

Some good changes were made to this bill. I am not saying it was not a good bill. It was tremendous legislation and a tremendous step forward but I believed it could be improved at the committee stage.

I think anyone who wants to seriously and without partisan consideration have a look at what we did at the legislative committee will agree that this bill was improved and that is the way it should be. That is the way the parliamentary system should work for private members who give their time and become involved with pieces of legislation. I think it is good for the groups that appear before the committee.

The hon. members who sat on that legislative committee will remember that one of the last witnesses, Professor Bala, said a lot of interesting things to the committee. He asked why we were making a distinction on the question of uncorroborated evidence of children. It is a good question and I believe I know why that distinction was made. It is because it has taken Parliament a long time to come to grips with the question of children's evidence.

We made substantive changes with Bill C–15 several years ago but I think we are still clearing away some of the common law misconceptions about children testifying in court. There are presumptions that the testimony of children is suspect or that children will lie on the stand. I think this 19th century concept has been discredited.

When a man like Professor Bala comes before the committee and asks why that distinction is being made and why we do not remove any reference to corroborated or uncorroborated children's evidence, if it makes sense why should we not do it? That is a healthy process and the way committee works.

That is why I have complete confidence in this bill that was carefully drafted by the individuals in the Department of Justice under the leadership and direction of the Minister of Justice. This wonderful piece of legislation that makes this country a better place to live was substantially improved at the legislative committee process.

This bill sends out a message to individuals who want to lavish unwanted attention on others, usually women. In the vast majority of cases when we talk about stalking women are the victims and recipients of continuous and repeated unwanted attention. We have sent the message out to those individuals through the Criminal Code saying if they want to engage in that kind of activity, it is a criminal offence in Canada for which they can be charged and imprisoned.

I think the actual wording of the legislation is improved. This bill went to the legislative committee as what was known as a specific intent offence. Several individuals and members of the legislative committee agreed that instead of making it a specific intent offence we would make it a general intent offence.

• (1215)

Again, we widened the scope of the bill to send a message to those individuals that the kind of activity that is sometimes engaged in by one individual against another is not going to be tolerated in Canada.

We also heard people say there may be problems with the reasonable test. Traditionally in the English common law and the interpretation of the criminal justice system the test was that of a reasonable man. For the most part the victims of criminal harassment and stalking are women. Groups came forward and said they wanted to make sure there was not a reasonable man test. All the circumstances that might be faced by an individual had to be looked at.

One of the changes is that the fear the individual feels for his or her safety must be reasonable under all the circumstances. We are sending a signal to the courts to take into consideration the total place that person has in society and any fears and concerns he or she may have.

We are sending out the message to look at the whole package.

It was pointed out to us this is not the only part of it. I welcome people like Monica Rainey and others who came before us and indicated that much of this bill deals with children and the problems they face with individuals who would sexually molest them. A lot of the legislation is directed toward that.

We made changes in the committee. It was pointed out by a number of members, and there was an amendment from the member of the NDP who is in the House saying that the penalty for the individual who intends to commit a sexual offence with a child outside this country is inadequate. I agree. I think she was absolutely correct and individuals came before the committee and indicated that this penalty should be increased. That was done and I think that is good.

This bill is also bad news for child molesters. Those individuals who are convicted of child molestation can now find themselves subject to a prohibition order that can last for life that prohibits these individuals from going near public places and parks where children play. This was something most of us received material about.

It happened in British Columbia and it happens in other provinces where some of these individuals are going from job to job and there seems to be a gap in the law. Under this bill a person can be prohibited from employment that puts him or her in direct contact with children. Who can be against that? How many Canadians can say that is a bad idea? That is a step in the right direction.

We made another significant change at the committee. Someone said: "Never mind employment that puts people in contact with children. What about the individual who is convicted of molesting children and wants to get involved with the Boy Scouts, Girl Guides or Big Brothers?" We covered that possibility as well. We included the prohibition of participating in voluntary organizations and I believe that, too, is a step in the right direction.

I know other members of the House want to talk about this. This is a good day for Parliament. This is a good day for the committee system of the House of Commons that good legislation can be made better.

It is a bad day for anybody out there who is in the business of molesting children because one standing committee of Parliament is dealing with the question of child pornography, making it a crime for the first time to possess child pornography and that is a good idea. This bill, and particularly that prohibition and some of the changes we made with respect to children giving evidence is bad news for people who are child molesters as well.

• (1220)

When this Parliament deals and comes to grips with such problems this Chamber once again, as it has throughout its history, brings honour upon itself and it makes me very proud to be a member of this House.

Ms. Mary Clancy (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak ultimately in support of this much needed bill. I certainly add my voice to that of the parliamentary secretary's in that I think some very good work was done in committee. I said this earlier at report stage.

I might suggest to the parliamentary secretary with the greatest of respect that it is perhaps a little soon to wax lyrical on how this bill, as active legislation, will assist in the matter. It is certainly a much needed bill. There are things we had to have which is why my party is supporting this bill today, but to suggest in any way that it may be flawless is to miss the point of legislation. Unfortunately none of us is blessed with the ability to create flawless legislation and this bill certainly has its flaws.

First and foremost however is the need for the legislation. It really is unnecessary to articulate the horrors surrounding the stalking bill and the need for a stalking bill. There have been deaths in almost every province and region of this country. We heard from attorneys general, police officers and various other sundry groups that those deaths could have been prevented with legislation such as this.

There were imperfections in the process. First and foremost, a major imperfection was the lack of consultation. I am going to address that in a few minutes when I talk about the responses of women's groups in this country to this bill.

There were other imperfections. Those of us on this side of the House were concerned at the tying together of the provisions relating to child abuse, particularly child sexual abuse, and the whole idea of the stalking amendments to the Code, the criminal harassment sections. I am really not imputing motive to the government. I can only say that my own reaction to this was that I was concerned we might be trying to pit the rights and needs of women against the rights and needs of children.

I think everyone will agree with me that in general, women are the primary care givers of children in this country, not always and in every case but in the vast majority of cases. There is something in every woman, whether she happens to be the primary care giver of a child or not, that distresses us to see even the suggestion of the rights of children put up in trade with the rights of women.

Again I compliment the parliamentary secretary and the government on the fact that they were most amenable in general on a number of the amendments which made the bill palatable and passable.

We have to be on our guard when dealing with these areas and particularly the areas that go so viscerally to the way we regard ourselves as a country, think about the protection of the weak and the need for true equality and true justice. We must put these bills in their proper places and not make the mix too varied to make it unpalatable at a future time.

To get back to the stalking provisions in particular, we are talking about a bill that goes after what can only be called fears of injury and death in the minds of far too many women in this country.

One question I posed to a number of witnesses during the committee stage of this bill was whether any bill was better than no bill, given the criticisms of the bill previous to its amendment. The response from all but the most vociferous critics was that yes, probably any bill was better than no bill.

• (1225)

I think we have a better bill than just any bill. However it goes to the root and seriousness of this problem that activists and advocates for women would say that any bill is better than no bill.

Let me talk just briefly about the criticisms of women's groups. I agree with my hon. colleague from New Westminster—Burnaby that the time was too short. I am going to articulate the criticisms made by women's groups, many with which I agree and a few with which I do not.

However I have to say that I was disappointed last Saturday by the reaction of the National Action Committee on the Status of Women, and in particular its new president. I congratulate its new president, Sunera Thobani. However I think there is a difficulty that needs to be articulated here.

Feminism and the women's movement is not monolithic. We can disagree and we clearly do. There are five political parties in this House and there are feminists in four of them anyway. That was probably an unfair shot—

Mr. Nicholson: There are some in the NDP.

Ms. Black: Don't forget about me.

Ms. Clancy: I have not forgotten the member at all. She is the hope to my left. The point that has to be made is that within the feminist movement we do disagree. We disagree on process, even if we do not disagree on goals.

I was disappointed because good and hard work was done by members of all three parties to try to make this better. I do not think there is any question from the members of the committee, or from members of this House, that the work done in that committee was done by the participants in good faith.

I have to say quite frankly that having been a member of that committee when I heard the president of the National Action Committee say that she was not going to support it my first response was that I had not seen the final draft of the amended bill even though I worked on it. Therefore, I wanted to know how someone who had not seen the final draft of the bill could be so certain that it was unworthy of passage.

I want to particularly deal with the criticism that it is similar to the American bills dealing with the stalking of movie stars. First of all, just because a woman happens to be a star of a soap opera or a film or is a famous woman does not make her any less vulnerable in a great number of ways.

I am thinking of that young television actress. She is no less dead because she was famous. A man came to the door of her house after stalking her and killed her on her own front doorstep. There is an actress who used to be in a soap opera in New York who can no longer work in the entertainment industry because of the actions of a stalker. She is in hiding because of what this man has done to her.

Our bill bears little or no resemblance to those American bills. Obviously there are similarities because we are dealing with similar problems, but this is not what we are looking at here. We are looking at what happens to ordinary people in Canada when they are faced with a stalker. The vast majority of ordinary persons in Canada who are faced with stalkers are women, not always and not in every case, but certainly the vast majority. I think that criticism was unfair and unfounded.

There are a couple of criticisms however that were not unfounded. The first is consultation, and I mentioned it before. To a degree the government probably now realizes that it did make a mistake on this. Certainly the consultation process on Bill C–49 created a good feeling, a good sense of support, and all the things we needed to bring forth what was in Bill C–49, which was good legislation as well. It was not perfect but good.

The precedent had been set for the hon. member for Vancouver Centre, who was then the Minister of Justice. I understand she is involved in something else over these next few days. I congratulate the current Minister of National Defence for that consultative process.

• (1230)

I understand why the women's groups were angry and why they felt left out. The front line workers asked: "Why did you not talk to us?" It was a mistake.

However, given the fact that a number of people continue to say we need this bill, such as the assistant deputy attorney general of Manitoba, the attorney general of Ontario, various police associations, the Canadian Bar Association and all kinds of witnesses who came before us, was the lack of consultation sufficient to jettison the bill?

No, it was not. It was a mistake but women, in particular, in this country need this bill. Therefore we should not go to the root of the matter and say we must go back to square one. I would hope in future that any and all governments would reinstate the consultative process but it should not kill this bill.

I am going to get a bit into technical legal arguments. I worry about this because there is a tendency for people with law degrees to sound pompous but I am certain that my colleagues will—

Mrs. Gaffney: Never.

Mr. Mifflin: Never.

Ms. Clancy: The hon. members for Nepean and Bonavista—Trinity—Conception have both reassured me, and neither one of those hon. members are lawyers.

The question of the preamble was one that was brought forward by a number of women's groups because the preamble sets out the intention of the legislation. They were particularly concerned about the specific fears and circumstances of women.

I understand that concern absolutely. I understand it to the very marrow of my bones because I know what it is like. I have represented hundreds of women who were hard done by in the legal system in a variety of manners. I understand that.

Martin's Annual Criminal Code of Canada comes out every year with all the amendments to the code. This one does not yet have the amendments as a result of Bill C–49. That will be in next year's Criminal Code.

Bill C–49 had a preamble but it is only the bill. It is only in the paper we have here that Bill C–49 includes the preamble. When Bill C–49 goes into the Criminal Code the preamble will not be there.

Consequently, when lawyers, defence or prosecution, and judges are sitting in the courtrooms of the land looking at this bill, looking at the amendments, then even if we had created a preamble it would not have made it into the Criminal Code. The odds on its affecting the judicial process are slim and none.

Second, part of the way trials are conducted and the legal process works in a courtroom is that we cannot cite a preamble. We can only cite the body of the bill. My consequent prejudice with regard to every one of these things is that we should not waste them in a preamble. If we want to say it then we should say it in the body of the bill.

The question of intent was very difficult. The amendment came through and the burden of proof has been considerably lessened by the addition of "knowing or recklessly". There is no question that it is difficult to prove intent. However if we take intent out in every way there is also no question that judges will infer intent based on the conduct of the accused and the fact that there is a concept of a mental element in almost every offence, and certainly offences of this nature.

The fact that we have the concept of recklessness in this bill will go a long way toward dealing with this problem. In criminal law we generally do not know how things are going to work until they are tried and interpreted and until they are judicially noted.

Professor Nicholas Bala told the committee that eliminating intent altogether means that the courts will then say that because there is this view that one can never be convicted of an offence without any kind of intent then they will say that the intent is that of causing reasonable fear and then we will have to show that the person intended to cause reasonable fear. That will be more difficult to prove than the amendment that we brought in.

• (1235)

The clause in section 2 of the bill as it now stands, with the amendment we made, is a far better situation than we had in the beginning. It will be easier but it will not be perfect. There will still be problems but the bill now reads: "No person shall, without lawful authority and knowing that another person is harassed, or recklessly as to whether the other person is harassed, engage in the conduct referred to in subsection 2".

It is not perfect but it is better. It goes a long way toward addressing the questions that were raised by women's groups in this particular area.

Then we have the question of reasonableness. This is again a bit of a lawyer's argument because those of us who suffered through law school have a tendency to be wedded intellectually to the reasonable test.

I can remember, and I brought this up at the press conference when the bill was introduced, when on my first or second day in law school a professor spoke about the reasonable man test. When the heads of the 20 women in the class all snapped up he immediately amended it, being a lawyer and knowing which way the wind was blowing, to the reasonable person test. In too many of our courts the reasonable person is still the reasonable man. That is a bona fide fear on the part of women who will have to go before the courts in this country.

They know it. They have seen it and there is nothing that anyone can say that is going to make it better because we know it is true. It is just like the old law about a husband and wife being one person at law, and that one person was the husband. It was not the wife. It was the husband.

What can we do to change this? There are a number of things we can do. Unfortunately most of them cannot be done in this bill because enforcement and the judicial process are not things that we can legislate easily. One of the things is mandatory gender sensitivity training for judges. I merely raise it. I know it is not in the bill but I have such a knee-jerk reaction to this sort of thing that I have been raising this for four years in this Chamber so I am going to raise it one more time.

No less a personage than Madam Justice Wilson has called for this and so have a lot of other lesser lights in this country, one of the least being myself. I keep being told over and over again that it is impossible. No it is not. It is not impossible. This Chamber could do it with the political will. Right now, the judicial institute in this country offers good gender sensitivity training for judges. It is good stuff. Sixty per cent of federally appointed Canadian judges have availed themselves of this training. In those courts one can see the difference. Forty per cent have not. In those courts one can see the difference too.

What do we do? I actually had one person say that they will die some day. I do not think I can wait that long and I do not think that the women of Canada can wait that long. Unfortunately some of them are not at death's door.

The problem is that age is not an indication of a lack of sensitivity. The lack of sensitivity can be as rampant in younger judges as it is in older judges. There are many older judges who because of their life experience are a lot more sensitive to this issue. I can think of a couple of senior members of the bench, very senior members, who were among the first to sign up for this training. Before I go off on a complete tangent I would just like to say that if there is one thing that we should be doing to make

things better for women in this country it is mandatory gender sensitivity training for judges in the federal area.

The next question was the whole question of reasonableness. That was amended. As my colleague for New Westminster—Burnaby has said, it is not necessarily perfect. It sure is not. It will depend on the judges and how they will interpret this. What it now says is: "No person shall without lawful authority and knowing that another person is harassed, or recklessly as to whether the other person is harassed, engage in conduct referred to in subsection 2 that causes that other person reasonably" and the amendment adds "in all the circumstances to fear for their safety or the safety of anyone known to them".

• (1240)

Is "in all the circumstances" sufficient? I do not know. I hope so. The problem is that we are going to have to depend to some degree on judicial discretion but "in all the circumstances" opens the door for the use of expert testimony called on behalf of the victim to talk about the circumstances relating to women.

One of the most common examples that has been used—it shows the utter insanity of stalkers and what they do—is the one ploy of sending flowers. Women have been inundated with roses or inundated with some other form of flowers. What has been in the history of the relationships between people who care for each other a symbol of romance, affection and all of these things becomes a symbol of horror, fear, domination and threat. It is clear that there are people whereby this "in all the circumstances" allows for testimony with regard to that kind of conduct. Is it enough? Again we do not know but we cannot at this stage of the game wait and see.

That is why I would have liked a review. That is why I still think a review is a good thing. However there are other ways that we can do the same thing. The bill obviously is amendable and this is what we are going to have to look at in the future if necessary. We are going to have to see whether or not "reasonable in all the circumstances" solves the problem.

I can say right now that if it does not solve the problem then every one of us here in this House is going to have to answer to the women's groups who have raised the question. We take in a sense a leap of faith because we want the best legislation we can get.

That in general deals with my concerns about this bill. In conclusion I merely want to say that the women of Canada need the protection of this bill. I hope to God it is enough. I know that many of us have worked hard to get to this point.

I too want to congratulate both the member for Moncton and the member for New Westminster—Burnaby for their private members' bills. This is one of the most serious problems facing our society today. We have to deal with it. We have to pass this bill. We have to hope that in other jurisdictions the sensitivity to enforcement will do something to ensure that women do not have to live in fear.

Ms. Dawn Black (New Westminster—Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, I rise once again to speak on Bill C-126 which would introduce for the first time a law to punish criminal harassment or stalking and which also takes legislative measures to prevent child abuse.

I now have a very thick pile of letters about stalking. The letters are mainly from women across Canada who have told me and told other members of this House that they want a stalking law. Some of these letters are from women who have been stalked. Some are from the families of women who have been threatened, incessantly harassed, beaten and terrorized. Terrorism is not too strong a word to use to describe the kind of behaviour that these women have been subject to.

I also have a large file of letters from particularly people from British Columbia who support the child abuse provisions of this bill. I know the parliamentary secretary mentioned earlier Monica Rainey and the organization that she is involved with, Citizens Against Child Exploitation. They have been very influential in raising the awareness of all members of Parliament about the issues behind these portions of the bill that deal with children.

• (1245)

Earlier, the member for Annapolis Valley—Hants talked about the response that he received to a mail out that he had done in his community. My New Democrat colleague, the member for Surrey North, did a mail out to his community in which he received back 2,500 responses on this issue of stalking. As the member for Annapolis Valley—Hants said, they were full responses giving detailed accounts of their own personal experience and saying how strongly they supported at that time my private member's bill on the issue of stalking. Over

30 B.C. municipalities, including the cities of New Westminister and Burnaby in my own community, supported my anti-stalking private member's bill and wrote to the Minister of Justice and others in the House to indicate that.

My bill had a minimum penalty for repeat offenders and those who break restraining orders. I felt that provision was very important. I am sorry that my amendment was not passed through the committee stage. All too often the men who engage in this harassment and terrorism thumb their noses at the court right in the court. They are served with a restraining order. I have been told by family practice lawyers, Crown prosecutors and others in the criminal justice system that on receipt of being handed that restraining order or peace bond, many of them have said right there in court that it is not worth the paper it is printed on and it is not going to protect her one bit.

All too frequently they are speaking the truth. Consider when the Manitoba government came to the committee stage. In all the cases cited in Manitoba where women have been killed there was a restraining order prohibiting that person from continuing his actions of harassment and terrorism.

There has been discussion in the House at all stages of this bill around private members' bills that have been put into the House. The private member's bill that was put forward by the member for Moncton was a provision that actually would have made the situation less protective for women. It is important for it to be acknowledged.

Often when we are talking about legislation such as this Bill C-126 we must be very careful that the legislation we propose as government members, ministers and in private members' bills meets the needs we are trying to address and that it will make the situation better for the people we are attempting to protect.

I have a petition here today which has been signed by over 1,800 people in support of a stalking law. I just received these petitions. There is not time to put them through the process of the House of Commons to officially table them as petitions. They were collected in a very short time by Stephanie Whitehead from the Windsor area who has worked tirelessly to raise her community's awareness of this issue. I want to make mention that in a very short time 1,800 people signed these petitions for an effective stalking law. It is indicative of the support that is out there in Canada at large in terms of supporting this legislation.

Criminal harassment or stalking and child abuse touch a chord I think within many of us. Some of these people are dealing with their own pain at having experienced this personally or have seen a family member or friend who has experienced this. Some are simply very concerned for others in our society and for the possibility that these issues may in future touch their own lives in a more personal way.

I very much support the provisions of the bill that are designed to facilitate child witnesses testifying and to replace the law on prohibition orders for convicted paedophilic sex offenders to prevent them from loitering around children. I presented two amendments to strengthen these sections. As the parliamentary secretary for the Minister of Justice said earlier, one of those amendments was passed at the committee stage. It was an amendment to raise the maximum penalty for intending to take a child outside the country to commit acts of violence, particularly sexual violence.

• (1250)

My unsuccessful amendment would have put the onus on the adult support person in a child sexual abuse case not to communicate with the child witness. The bill currently places equal onus on a frightened child of five or whatever who has been sexually abused not to communicate in any way with the adult even to say that perhaps they are scared and frightened and want to go home. I do not think this is in keeping with what the bill is intended to do. That is my concern on that issue.

In order for the bill to be effective it requires very effective education of police officers, Crown attorneys and judges about the issues of violence against women, criminal harassment, child abuse and about the equality rights of all women in our society.

As the member for Halifax said earlier, my fear is that without this kind of education the bill will be used inconsistently. I am concerned that the bill will be used inconsistently and will not be reflected in our court system the way all of us here in the House of Commons and all of us who worked on the committee stage of the bill want to see this enforced.

It is important to say that we also need financial support for shelters for battered women, rape crisis centres and funding for groups who advocate on behalf of abused women and children and who do a lot of the necessary education in their communities with an extremely low budget.

Some provincial governments are taking positive steps on violence against women. The New Democrat government in British Columbia has set up 80 new counselling services for women who are victims of violence. It has funded 11 new sexual assault centres and tripled the number of government funded centres in British Columbia. It has put $2 million into programs for aboriginal communities to end this kind of violence. It has instituted training programs for prosecutors, police, judges and service providers who work with these victims of violence. It has also instituted teacher training and a school curriculum to attempt to prevent violence. It has funded 145 new spaces in transition home shelters for women across British Columbia. It has given top priority in non-profit housing units for women who are leaving abusive situations and abusive partners. It has issued another directive to the police and to the Crowns in British Columbia to arrest and prosecute violent offenders to the fullest extent.

However, not every woman in Canada lives in British Columbia or in Ontario which has also taken steps to educate on these issues, and support women's centres, shelters and services and to prevent violence.

A Crown prosecutor in Montreal recently said that even under the proposed stalking law offenders will probably be charged by way of summary conviction which is accompanied by very short penalties. She said judges would be reluctant to hand out severe sentences for what they might consider to be normal behaviour. She said that many judges just think of such crimes as the pursuit of love.

In fact in the case of a man who broke a court order to keep away from his ex-girlfriend after being convicted of intimidating her, the judge told the woman: "You are going through what a lot of couples experience which is a domestic quarrel". He also said that the case was better suited to an afternoon talk show than to the courts.

Criminal harassment of women is just not taken seriously. One Montreal woman was telephoned incessantly, followed and watched at her apartment by her ex-boyfriend. In the period of one month she complained to the police almost daily about his repeated phone calls, his intimidation and a rock through her window. He threatened her but the police told her that there was nothing they could do. Before they could act he needed to say something like: "I will kill you". Earlier this month he did attempt to kill her by stabbing her six times with a knife.

This bill is trying to stop that kind of behaviour before it escalates into attempted murder and murder, but I do not believe the government has given the police and the courts the proper tools to do that because without education offenders will merely be given probation like the case of woman who was confined and sexually assaulted for nine hours. Her attacker was out on bail and stalked, intimidated and terrorized her. He received 15 months probation for that behaviour.

• (1255)

This bill does not change the police officer or the attitude of the people who will respond in the future to those kinds of complaints. It does not change the Crown prosecutor who decides whether a case is serious enough to pursue. It does not change the judge who thinks intimidation is an ordinary part of human relationships and a matter for the Oprah show rather than the courts.

A new law which gives the courts the option of sentencing a repeat offender to a light penalty is not going to deter these obsessive men who spend their time and money to make a woman miserable, but most importantly to control her life. This is what we are talking about in this legislation: another person who wants to have total power and control over another individual's life.

Sadly, these offenders laugh at our criminal justice system because they know that no one will do anything to prevent their behaviour.

I believe this law on criminal harassment is a step forward. I am pleased to be here debating this today. I am pleased to have been the member of Parliament from my political party who had the opportunity to sit in on the legislative proceedings. But we must all remind

ourselves that we are taking a small step forward today. It is an important step but it is just a small step forward. There are so many other things that have to be put in place in a holistic way to address these problems of violence in our society. The law simply will not do it.

Women of colour and immigrant women came to us and talked about how when they report assault or harassment they have been asked by judges if that is not just a part of their culture. They spoke about being harassed by the authorities rather than protected and felt a sense of revictimization.

The Disabled Women's Network came forward and talked about the problems that disabled women have in accessing the criminal justice system and how many disabled women are more vulnerable to violence and yet not believed.

Other national women's groups came forward. They did not support the bill in its wording and talked about the phrase "reasonable fear". They were concerned it might be used against women who could be put on trial. They gave the example of a woman who had undergone some kind of therapy in her personal life having that raised in the court to imply she really did not have it all together. Who would not have to undergo therapy if they had been subjected to the kinds of terror these women have been subjected to? Women's organizations were also concerned about lawyers for the defence saying these people suffer from false memory syndrome. This is being applied to children who were sexually assaulted and women who have been abused and assaulted.

I put forward an amendment in committee to remove the word "reasonable" but unfortunately I was the only one there who supported that amendment. I also put forward a number of amendments to remove the intent provision, exempt labour disputes and provide minimum penalties for repeat offenders. I am really disappointed that did not pass in view of the way these people continue to break those restraining orders, break those peace bonds, show no concern for the victim, show no respect at all for our system of justice or for Parliament and continue to thumb their noses at the courts.

I proposed an amendment to add a preamble to the bill which would explain the issue of criminal harassment. I understand the member for Halifax who indicated there was no sense in doing this because it would not be printed in the Criminal Code. It would be there, however, for reference as it is in Bill C–49 in terms of judges, Crown attorneys who want to know what Parliament's intent really was in this legislation. It certainly would not have hurt anything. It was ruled out of order unfortunately.

I want to end with some stories from women who have been stalked. They capture the need for a strong, effective anti–stalking law.

One woman has been stalked for eight years. She wrote to me and said: "Being watched, followed, assaulted, vandalized, robbed, threatened with your life, harassed at school and at work is not romantic. It is a violation of one's rights and freedoms". She also said—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): I am sorry but it being one o'clock p.m. I do now leave the chair until two o'clock p.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(2).

The House took recess at 1 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 31

[*Translation*]

WHIP'S OFFICE

Mr. Marcel R. Tremblay (Québec–Est): Madam Speaker, as we all know, our party has recently been through a most stimulating and promising period of renewal, a most exciting exercise. This kind of situation, if Parliament is to work properly, requires tremendous discipline and, above all, a team of professionals that is truly out of the ordinary.

That is why today, as senior assistant to the Chief Government Whip, I would like to stress the exceptional job done by the team in the Whip's office, and I am referring to David, Pascale, Irma, Barbara, Brenda, Jean–Charles, Léo and Josée, who provided the continuity that is so essential to the work of parliamentarians. Our thanks to you all.

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT POLICIES

Mr. Guy H. Arseneault (Restigouche—Chaleur): Madam Speaker, I believe that in the dying days of this government it is indeed the time to set the record straight.

After nine years with the Conservatives at the helm Canadians will not forget the legacy of this government.

[*Translation*]

It leaves an ever growing deficit; 1.6 million Canadians out of work; an alarming poverty rate which the government tries to camouflage with new criteria; 38 tax increases since 1984; attacks on our social programs and our quality of life; and Canada's regions abandoned as a result of cutbacks in funding for regional development.

[*English*]

This government's legacy is one of broken trust and lost hope. As one of my hon. colleagues has stated, under this government "the rich got richer, the poor got poorer and the middle class got shafted".

This Prime Minister's record speaks for itself.

* * *

[*Translation*]

THE HON. MEMBER FOR LAC-SAINT-JEAN

Mr. Guy Saint-Julien (Abitibi): Madam Speaker, on April 27, 1993, a man who was ambassador to Paris from 1985 to 1988, the hon. member for Lac-Saint-Jean stated in this House: "A natural modesty has always prevented me from reporting on my tight management of the embassy in Paris. I was the most highly rated ambassador in Europe at the time for my management".

For the information of Canadian taxpayers, under Michel Dupuy, the operating budget for the mission in 1984-85 was $4.9 million. Under the hon. member for Lac-Saint-Jean, in 1985-86 it was $5.6 million; in 1986-87; $7.4 million; in 1987-88; $8.4 million. An increase of $3.5 million in three years, not including travel and entertainment expenses.

Today, as Moody's in New York lowers Quebec's rating, I would not blame Canadian taxpayers for being very "moody" if asked to give a good rating to our ambassador to Paris from 1985 to 1988, considering this 60 per cent increase over three years.

* * *

[*English*]

STANLEY CUP

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce): Madam Speaker, as you can see I am very proud of this sweater. It represents greatness in hockey and a standard of excellence for all Canadians.

I had one like it when I was six years old but it was the thick woolly kind with a turtleneck that we wore at an outdoor rink when it was 20 below zero. I have loved this sweater ever since. One begins with two points just by having it on.

I must say, however, that I was not so proud of some fans who destroyed property and became violent last night. This is the 100th anniversary of the Stanley Cup and in that time six Montreal teams have won the cup 41 times, including the first time in 1893. The Canadiens have won it 24 times.

[*Translation*]

I want to congratulate Jacques Demers, the organization of the Canadiens and the great team itself, where all players are superstars. The Canadiens have brought the Stanley Cup home again!

* * *

• (1405)

[*English*]

CANADA SUMMER GAMES

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops): Madam Speaker, I would also like to give my congratulations to the Canadiens on an outstanding performance. However my statement is with regard to the following.

The great city of Kamloops has the honour of hosting the 1993 Canada Summer Games. For this privilege we thank the federal government for its generosity and for its demonstration of confidence in our citizens' ability to showcase this great Canadian event.

These games are truly extraordinary. This summer two new exciting aspects of the games are included. Disabled Olympians will be participating for the first time and traditional aboriginal games will form an integral part of the competition. At the same time, Kamloops will host one of the largest Indian powwows in North America as well as a full-scale western rodeo.

The hosting of the games will include many dynamic communities throughout the Kamloops region, which is considered to be one of the most beautiful and pristine areas of all of Canada.

I urge all Canadians to join us this summer to support Canada's most outstanding young athletes who will be competing in Kamloops during the 1993 Canada Summer Games. Come and enjoy the games, our beautiful city and its region.

* * *

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Howard Crosby (Halifax West): Madam Speaker, let me tell the member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce that we in the maritimes regard the Montreal Canadiens as a national institution and not just the sole claim of the city of Montreal.

Madam Speaker, you may remember all the soul searching that took place in the House of Commons about the merits of the UI changes. The NDP was really upset about terminating UI benefits to voluntary quitters, by most standards a common sense measure.

Now we know why. It seems the NDP has a cost-saving scheme in place courtesy of the UI program. The party pays the unelected leader for enough months to qualify and then the leader quits and receives UI benefits.

The NDP leader in Prince Edward Island thinks he can quit his post and receive UI, thus saving the party $4,000. However the money comes from the pockets of hard-working Canadians. The NDP says: "So what? We pay our premiums". This is a fine example for other Canadians.

Hopefully common sense will prevail with the NDP, otherwise our UI deficit will soar to new heights.

AGRICULTURE

Mrs. Louise Feltham (Wild Rose): Madam Speaker, every day we hear members in this House complain about what the government is or is not doing.

Today I want to pass out a bouquet to my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, for the difficult decisions he has made in the last week. He deserves congratulations following two very important announcements that satisfied the long-standing concerns of many of my constituents.

The minister first announced a continental barley market which will open up significant opportunities for western barley growers. The minister also announced the establishment of a producer payment panel to oversee the shift of the Crow rate benefit from railways to producers.

Both of these changes will be beneficial to western farmers. I thank the minister for his attention to these important matters.

* * *

MINERS MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. David Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond): Madam Speaker, tomorrow, June 11, 1993, is miners memorial day in Cape Breton. This day holds a special place in the hearts of Cape Bretoners as it commemorates the work of our coal miners.

The life of a coal miner has changed through the years but the danger of working underground continues to be a haunting element of that industry.

Tomorrow is a day when we recognize the hard work of our miners and remember those who have sacrificed their lives for that industry. It is an emotional day for many. For some it brings back a sense of pride. For others it brings back a sense of fear and sadness.

We will also remember the families of our coal miners, the wives, mothers and children who waited on the surface only to have their worst fears come true.

On behalf of my constituents in Cape Breton—East Richmond I salute our Cape Breton coal miners for their contribution not only to our local economy but also to our culture, our history and our sense of pride on the island.

[*Translation*]

THE LATE MARIE LANDRY-VIGNEAULT

Mr. Charles A. Langlois (Manicouagan): Madam Speaker, today the people of Natashquan, on the North Shore, mourn the loss of a pioneer whose dedication and zeal were an inspiration to those around her. Marie Landry-Vigneault, mother of Gilles Vigneault, the famous North Shore poet, died yesterday in Natashquan. She was 101 years old.

She will be remembered as a woman of exceptional talents. A mother of eight children, a teacher and also an occasional author under the pseudonym "La Marieouche", she was widely known and respected by all.

In my capacity as member of Parliament for Manicouagan in the House of Commons, it is a privilege to pay tribute to this remarkable woman whose wisdom and experience are now part of the annals of the North Shore. Today, Quebecers join her son Gilles and her daughter Bernadette in singing that famous song: "Dame Marie, c'est à votre tour, de vous laisser parler d'amour".

* * *

• (1410)

[*English*]

FOREIGN AID

Mr. Dan Heap (Trinity—Spadina): Madam Speaker, Canada and other developed countries use aid to subsidize domestic industry and promote foreign policy aims, according to a report entitled *The Reality of Aid* by the Canadian Council for International Co-operation and other non-governmental agencies around the world.

The report particularly criticizes tied aid, which is when donor countries give aid on the condition that it be used to buy goods and services from the donor country.

Canada spends 65 cents of every official development aid dollar in Canada. Tied aid increases costs by limiting competition, stifles the development of indigenous industries and skills and locks the recipient country into dependence upon parts and maintenance that may be expensive and inappropriate.

I call on Canada's government to abolish this kind of phoney aid and instead establish fair and equal trading relations with the countries of the south.

[*Translation*]

CREDIT CARDS

Mr. Jean-Pierre Hogue (Outremont): Madam Speaker, this week the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs published its latest quarterly report, this time about credit card costs. In the report, consumers are informed about costs connected with the use of credit cards, to help them choose and use credit cards wisely.

Furthermore, as the summer holiday season approaches, consumers should remember to take additional precautions when using their credit cards. They should always keep them in a safe place. A person's vacation can be ruined if his or her credit cards are stolen. And besides, credit card thefts increase costs for all consumers.

I therefore urge all Canadian consumers to get a copy of this publication from their nearest Consumer and Corporate Affairs office. Don't leave home without it.

* * *

[*English*]

YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION OF CANADA

Ms. Mary Clancy (Halifax): Madam Speaker, the YWCA was founded in 1855 in England to assist independent young women in fully developing their intellectual, physical and spiritual strength.

Today the organization is an international movement. The first Canadian branch was opened in an Atlantic Canadian city, Saint John, New Brunswick in 1870, and then in Halifax in 1875.

Just last week at its annual meeting the YWCA elected as its national president, Dale Godsoe, a Haligonian and an outstanding volunteer and community activist in both social and political spheres.

The YWCA was founded on the qualities of strength, usefulness and responsibility, and those values still hold true today. The organization is a valuable place for women of all walks of life to gain leadership skills and life management training to help them meet the needs of an evolving community and society. The YWCA is an excellent advocate for women in this country and around the world.

I want to send my congratulations to the new president and the YWCA board and ask them to continue their fight for the women of Canada.

* * *

INTERPROVINCIAL TRADE

Mr. Greg Thompson (Carleton—Charlotte): Madam Speaker, provincial trade ministers met in Vancouver this week to discuss the elimination of trade barriers between the provinces.

It appears that a process has been negotiated which will lead to a dismantling of barriers. This agreement, scheduled to take effect by July 1994, is most welcome and long overdue. Provinces should be commended for recognizing that it is time to tear down the obstacles that hinder growth within the Canadian economy.

According to the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, 95 per cent of its member companies said they received no benefit from internal trade barriers. The elimination of these barriers will go a long way toward strengthening the economies of our provinces and will benefit all Canadians.

* * *

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA HEART INSTITUTE

Mr. Len Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke): Madam Speaker, I recently had the great privilege of returning to the House of Commons after demolishing my car in a serious car accident, followed by urgent preventative open heart surgery. The potential heart problem was discovered by Dr. Leach and his wonderful cardiology personnel at the National Defence Medical Centre.

The operation was performed by Dr. Wilbert Keon and his staff at the University of Ottawa Heart Institute at the Ottawa Civic Hospital before a major problem could occur.

When I returned to this House I was taken by storm when all members on both sides of this Chamber rose to give me a very warm welcome back. I extend my very sincere thanks to all members for that excellent dose of mental therapy. In spite of what many may think this place has its moments of decency, kindness and understanding, and I thank everyone for it.

• (1415)

I pay tribute to Dr. Wilbert Keon to whom many of us owe our lives. This man could have gone off to California, Texas or Boston and written his own financial contract. He chose to stay home and to build a first class heart institute in the nation's capital and at the same time to train other medical personnel. We thousands who owe our lives to him and his colleagues salute him as a great and dedicated Canadian.

At the same time our best from all members of the House goes out to Mr. Speaker, his wife, Kate, and family as he recuperates in Vancouver. We wish him well.

* * *

TONY AWARDS

Mr. Ian Waddell (Port Moody—Coquitlam): Madam Speaker, I am particularly pleased to make this statement seeing that you, a former actress, are in the chair. I want to extend the congratulations of the House to my old friend, Brent Carver, who this week received a Tony Award for his role in the Broadway musical *Kiss of a Spider Woman*.

Brent is from Cranbrook, British Columbia. I first met him in the Arts Club of Vancouver. I want to congratulate also Garth Drabinsky, Live Entertainment of Canada Inc., Des McAnuff on his director's award and Adrea Martin on her best feature actress award.

These people were probably born talented, but I would remind the House that Brent and the others have been beneficiaries of Canadian government public investment in the arts, in theatre and in films.

In accepting her award Adrea Martin thanked her family, and I quote, "for giving me my roots and my hairdresser, Gary, for restoring them to their natural colour".

We thank them all for their Canadian roots. It was a great week for Canadian talent in New York.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

NORTH AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Speaker, I have a question for the Deputy Prime Minister.

Yesterday President Clinton said that NAFTA was in trouble in Congress and that the talks on side deals were at a complete impasse.

When the government forced the vote in the House of Commons last month telling us there was no problem with the deal, was it because the Conservative government was incompetent to forecast what was happening or was it because the Conservative government was trying to mislead Canadian people?

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Industry, Science and Technology and Minister for International Trade): Madam Speaker, I guess we are going to have the same sort of twisting of things by members opposite, but let me make it quite clear that what we have legislated is simply to prepare ourselves for a NAFTA by the implementing legislation that results in changes to 23 different statutes if the other countries do the same.

If the other countries do not implement their NAFTA legislation then the terms of the legislation says that the legislation we passed in the House the other day will not go into force. We are simply preparing for the agreement when it comes and we are confident it will come in spite of the comments of my friend opposite. We want to put our business people in a position where they can plan to take advantage of the opportunities that are there and ensure they will be there.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Speaker, that is really funny. The minister has good intentions; he would like businessmen to be able to plan in Canada. But yesterday again, the U.S. government came up with a third proposal, this time on import surges. The U.S. government is proposing a third subject for a parallel accord.

Why does the Canadian government not want to do as the Americans now, namely move the issue forward and hold discussions immediately to get a clear definition of subsidy and of dumping, so that businessmen can plan and not be caught in the situation which the steel industry finds itself in now?

• (1420)

[*English*]

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Industry, Science and Technology and Minister for International Trade): Madam Speaker, I do not know where my friend has been. There is nothing new about the proposal on import surges. That was signalled by the U.S. president when he was running for president back in October 1992. There is nothing new in this.

My hon. says: "Let us clarify matters with relation to subsidies". That is precisely what we are doing during the Uruguay round negotiations. I am sure he would be very pleased to see that those negotiations have progressed significantly with the meeting I chaired in Toronto about a month ago and then the subsequent meeting in Paris last week that I attended with my counterparts in other countries. We will be continuing this process later this month in Tokyo.

We will be able to get a very solid response to the concerns he has expressed about subsidies which we share. We have agreed with the United States that we would pursue this through the Uruguay round.

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Speaker, if they are concerned about subsidies and dumping why have they not taken the initiative to have the definition incorporated into the NAFTA? Why wait for the other proposition that might never come to fruition?

Yesterday I met with the steel industry. It is very competitive but it had the surprise of its life. The Canadian board under the authority of this government is permitting producers of steel from abroad to dump it in the Canadian economy. The board says that there is no injury, but it does not take a genius to understand that if we let people dump in our market eventually the dumping price will reduce the price producers are receiving in Canada. When will this government do something about it?

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Industry, Science and Technology and Minister for International Trade): Madam Speaker, my hon. friend asked two questions. The answer to the first question on why we are using the GATT negotiations to resolve the questions on subsidies

is that we have seen we can get a greater response from the Americans in the broader context of the Uruguay round than we can in the discussions and negotiations on the FTA.

That is why we are focusing our attention there. If my hon. friend reads the proposals in the Dunkel paper on the Uruguay round negotiations, the GATT negotiations, he will see they are very positive as far as Canada is concerned.

My hon. friend raises a question about the steel industry. The Deputy Prime Minister and I met with steel industry representatives last night. We have agreed on some matters which will be discussed with their representatives. Indeed the representatives of the industry met with officials earlier today to address the problems they have, problems and concerns that we share. We believe we can address this matter much better in a co–operative way as we have agreed last night.

* * *

STEEL INDUSTRY

Mr. Bob Speller (Haldimand—Norfolk): Madam Speaker, my question is for the same minister. The minister is aware through his meeting yesterday with the Canadian steel industry that the industry is hurting and that it does not have access to the American market.

What immediate action is the minister prepared to take to put Canadian steel workers back to work and to make sure our Canadian steel industry continues to be viable?

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Industry, Science and Technology and Minister for International Trade): Madam Speaker, again my hon. friend is demonstrating ignorance of the issues.

My hon. friend is saying that Canadian companies do not have access to the market. What he ignores when he says that is the level of exports, the market share Canadian companies have in the U.S. market, has gone from about 3.25 per cent recently to the 4 per cent to 5 per cent range. There is access. He cannot blame the problems of the steel industry on lack of access.

If he wants to address what the problems of the steel industry are there is a range of issues he can address, many of which are in the hands of the steel industry and the steel unions themselves and not matters that are the responsibility of governments.

Mr. Bob Speller (Haldimand—Norfolk): Madam Speaker, our steel industry is as competitive as any in the world as long as the minister stands up for it.

• (1425)

The minister should be aware that the recent ruling against the Canadian steel interests by his Tory appointed trade tribunal has hurt the Canadian industry. Canada has been known as the dumping ground for steel from all around the world.

Will the minister send a strong message to the international community and to his trade tribunal that Canada will not be a dumping ground for steel from all around the world?

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Industry, Science and Technology and Minister for International Trade): Madam Speaker, let me make a point about what my hon. friend has just said.

We have been taking as strong a position as we possibly can in representing the steel industry in discussions it has had with the United States and in objectives it has in dealing with the United States market.

The issue my hon. friend has raised relates to a decision by a quasi–judicial board.

Mr. Marchi: Nonsense.

Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): My hon. friend says: "Nonsense". There again is a demonstration of the ignorance of the people on the other side of the House when they ask these questions.

The point is that the decision was taken by an independent quasi–judicial board. My hon. friend may have disagreements with that. The industry may have disagreements with that. The industry can appeal. It is not the position, the role or the possibility for governments to direct that quasi–judicial board on what might or might not be the results of its decisions.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. Jim Karpoff (Surrey North): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister.

The Canadian Hospital Association today released a report on health care reform entitled *An Open Future, A Shared Vision* which clearly states that after eight years of Tory rule the state of Canada's economy is a threat to our health care system and a threat to the health of Canadians. It recognizes the link between unemployment, poverty and poor health.

Both leading contenders for the Tory leadership have supported the government's economic policy and have promised to stay the course.

In view of the report by the Canadian Hospital Association, will the government now change its economic policy and implement a full employment policy as called for by the Leader of the New Democratic Party?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance): Madam Speaker, one of the reasons the leadership candidates are wisely taking the position they are going to stay the course in terms of the government's economic policy is the fact that again today we see the Statistics Canada composite leading indicator rising by .8 per cent. That is the largest increase in two years. That is further testimony to the fact that in the fourth quarter of 1992 we had a gross domestic product growth in real terms of 3.5 per cent and almost 4 per cent in the first quarter of 1993.

What is most encouraging and most important is that this growth is occurring in the goods producing sector, that sector that will generate jobs today and in the future.

Mr. Jim Karpoff (Surrey North): Madam Speaker, my supplementary question is for the same minister.

The report by the Canadian Hospital Association states that in order to prevent the Balkanization of our health care system there must be stable federal government funding of health care at a level that will allow the federal government to enforce national standards.

In view of this statement will the government now commit that it will restore the established programs funding for health care?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance): Madam Speaker, as I have indicated in the House many times between the period 1984–85 to 1992–93 transfers to the provinces have grown at a rate of 5.2 per cent per year. That has caused almost a doubling in the amount of transfers made by the federal government to the provinces.

Something in the order of $40.5 billion in cash and tax point transfers will be made to the provinces this year. Even though our program expenditures will grow in real terms at zero or 1.5 per cent nominal, the growth in transfers to the provinces over the next five-year period will be just under 4 per cent. That is clear indication based on past statistics and future projections that the funding will be provided in an orderly and acceptable fashion.

Mr. Jim Karpoff (Surrey North): Madam Speaker, because of the cutbacks in federal transfer payments by the government the report outlines a number of alternatives for financing of health care which include direct user charges or, as we would call them, user fees. New Democrats of course will oppose such altering of funding.

• (1430)

Will the Deputy Prime Minister again confirm that in spite of the waffling from the Tory leadership candidates that his government will not allow the provinces to introduce user fees?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance): Madam Speaker, to reiterate the point that I made earlier, the growth in federal transfers to the provinces has risen from $25.6 billion in 1984–85 to $40.5 billion in 1993–94. It continues to grow at a rate of something just under 4 per cent.

What has to be said here is that most of the stakeholders in the health care sector are suggesting that it is not necessarily a matter of more money, it is a matter of spending the money more effectively and using the resources more effectively and efficiently. That is precisely what the HEAL organization is all about and I suspect is what is really underlying some of the recommendations that are enshrined in this report.

NORTH AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Hon. Roy MacLaren (Etobicoke North): Madam Speaker, the government has repeatedly justified pushing NAFTA through Parliament before the negotiation of the side accords on the ground that the agreement would not be altered by the two side accords.

Now the United States has said NAFTA will be "modified" and "interpreted" by the side accords.

Does the minister not agree that this confirms what the Official Opposition has been saying all along, that the United States fully intends to alter NAFTA through the negotiation of the side accords?

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Industry, Science and Technology and Minister for International Trade): Madam Speaker, I am not quite sure to what my hon. friend is referring.

But I can say that time and time again the President of the United States, the President of Mexico, the Prime Minister of Canada, ministers responsible, have all said and agreed on many occasions that there will be no reopening of the NAFTA by any agreement among the three countries. What we signed on December 17 last year is what is being legislated.

Hon. Roy MacLaren (Etobicoke North): Madam Speaker, I do not know then what the United States means by the words "modified and interpreted".

Let me ask the minister this. Despite the fact that the negotiation of the two side accords on the environment and labour standards has already reached an impasse, the United States now says it will soon unveil its proposal for a third side accord on import surges, to which the Leader of the Opposition referred just a moment ago.

There is also growing pressure in some areas of Congress for a fourth side agreement on monetary policy co-ordination, whatever that may mean.

Were such issues discussed? Were import surges discussed at the recent Washington meetings? If so, what is the Canadian government's position? Do we oppose the idea of further side agreements on import surges and possibly monetary co-ordination or do we not?

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Industry, Science and Technology and Minister for International Trade): Madam Speaker, let me quote something from Reuters. "If you were to ask me if we've reached an impasse I would say no", said chief U.S. negotiator Rufus Yerxa.

On the question of monetary policy co-ordination, I have never heard of that. That may be something that someone in Congress has floated in the course of some comments on the NAFTA. It has never been a point of discussion and certainly would be a non-starter as far this government is concerned.

On the question of import surges I commented in relation to a question that his leader has put to me. The question of import surges was raised last October. The Americans have some views on it but we agreed that there would be no basis for discussing anything on import surges if it resulted in a reopening of the agreement. Ambassador Kantor has said on a number of occasions he agrees that the matter of import surges is well covered in the NAFTA agreement itself.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Mr. Douglas Young (Acadie—Bathurst): Madam Speaker, the recent finance minister's meeting resulted in the recognition that the debt and deficit situation in Canada is certainly a major crisis. Obviously the continuing shell game of offloading the tax burden from one level of government to another is not satisfactory.

• (1435)

I want to ask the Minister of Finance why his government has not considered convening a tri-level conference on debt and deficit management involving the provinces but also involving representatives of the Canadian Federation of Municipalities so that we can arrive at a consensus on how to resolve this serious problem.

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance): Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his suggestion. We have been attempting to put in place some process where we can achieve greater co-ordination and co-operation at the federal and the provincial levels.

We have gone some distance particularly as a result of the meeting of finance ministers held in December and again the two-day meeting we had just a week or so ago.

I do not think there is any question in anyone's mind that deficit and debt are clearly the major challenges we face as a government. I do not think there is any doubt in anyone's mind that we have to deal with this issue in a co-operative fashion.

In regard to that, we have agreed on a work plan over the summer to carry out a number of initiatives which will look at the whole cost of government, how we might reduce duplication and overlap, how we might streamline and increase the efficiency of government both at the federal and provincial levels. Of course the municipal level would also be taken into consideration. There may be some scope for the hon. member's suggestion.

Mr. Douglas Young (Acadie—Bathurst): Madam Speaker, the taxpayer who gets the bill in the mail does not really care what level of government it comes from.

There may be significant changes in the status of a number of people on the other side after the weekend. Does the Minister of Finance agree there has to be a consensus on how we resolve this matter? Should the Government of Canada not show some leadership in getting the municipalities and the provinces on line in managing both the deficit and the debt?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance): Madam Speaker, I agree with the hon. member there is only one taxpayer.

That is something we identified quite some time ago and is why it is important for all levels of government to face the challenge squarely of dealing with the deficit and the debt.

I submit to the hon. member that we are showing leadership. We convened the meeting. We are showing initiative. We took some steps in the constitutional debate to put in place a process in which we could have better co-ordination of our budgetary process while working more closely with the provinces.

That process is under way. The work plan has been established and there is agreement between the two levels of government to work toward achieving that goal. I think the results of the reduction in the deficit from 8.8 per cent of GDP in 1992-1993 to 7.2 per cent in 1993-1994 is a pretty clear indication of the results of that effort.

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops): Madam Speaker, speaking of the debt issue, the Minister of Finance must have been quite surprised this morning to read from the Moody's Investor Services that the Canadian government seems to have dramatically over-estimated and in some cases perhaps even deliberately heightened the fear of a possible debt crisis in this country.

It would appear that the Government of Canada is using the threat of financial chaos to win support for some ideological vision of the country which encourages them to remove and reduce support for social programs.

My question is for the Minister of Finance. Considering that late yesterday the Minister of the Environment, one of the leadership candidates, indicated that he would cut $8 billion in the transfers of the provinces and in light of the news today from Moody's Investor Services, is it not time for this government to stop offloading on to provincial jurisdictions?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance): Madam Speaker, it is rather incredible how the New Democratic Party can twist and turn and mislead with something that is pretty clearly stated in a statement issued by Moody's. It said "several recently published reports have grossly exaggerated Canada's fiscal debt position. Some of them have double-counted numbers while others have made inappropriate international comparisons, comparing Canadian gross debt to other countries' net debt. These inaccurate measurements may have played a role in exaggerating evaluations".

It did not mention that the Government of Canada was deliberately misleading or overstating the debt.

• (1440)

It goes on to say the issue of the deficit and the debt is a great concern, acknowledging that the federal government has a plan to reduce the deficit, has acknowledged as well that the provinces have brought in very tough budgets to deal with the deficits. One of the representatives of Moody's went on to say: "Investors will lose confidence in Canadian bonds if governments do not begin to reduce both the federal and provincial deficit". It clearly outlines the importance of dealing with the

deficit issue but the encouraging news is that it has given Canada a low risk rating which obviously I welcome.

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops): Madam Speaker, as Mr. Francis has indicated, it gives Canada a low risk rating. What it suggests to him is that Moody's puts the debt burden in Canada at 50 per cent of GDP and the United States debt burden at 48 per cent of GDP. We recognize that the Clinton administration has taken a number of proactive steps to try to generate life back into their economy and this government is doing nothing.

The Minister of Finance is aware of the Auditor General's report that says that two of the major reasons we have a deficit crisis is because of the government's monetary policy of high interest rates and the myriad of tax loopholes that continue to exist in our tax system, including the family trust that was just recently introduced by this government once again.

If the Minister of Finance is serious about this debt issue, will he do the right and proper thing and start closing off in some serious way these massive tax loopholes that continue to exist, like the family trust.

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance): Madam Speaker, I know the hon. member speaking on behalf of the New Democratic Party would like to see the capital gains exemption and exemptions to small business removed because they consider them to be tax loopholes.

The hon. members talks of Canada having excessively high interest rates. Let us look at the facts. He is criticizing Canada's monetary policy.

An hon. member: It spreads.

Mr. Mazankowski: It spreads. Let us deal with the prime interest rate. On May 25 Canada's prime rate was at 6 per cent, the United States prime rate 6 per cent, France's prime rate 8.8 per cent, Germany's prime rate is 10 per cent, the United Kingdom is 7 per cent and Italy is 12.25 per cent. I ask you, Madam Speaker, are Canada's interest rates high or low? They are the lowest in the pack.

CANADA POST

Mr. Jim Jordan (Leeds—Grenville): Madam Speaker, all the members of Parliament recently received this very attractive Canada Post annual report. It has terms like "on code, track and trace, enhanced targetry" and so on.

My question is for the minister responsible for Canada Post. Why does the government not tell us in the report how many rural post offices were closed in 1992–93? In other words, at what price to rural Canada was this so–called successful year realized?

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, I certainly want to offer the hon. member a briefing on all those difficult technical terms so he will be able to understand the report.

The hon. member may also be interested, if he is fair–minded, in the number of new postal outlets opened in rural Canada. It has been a ratio of 2:1; two openings for one closing. In fact, the total number is increasing.

He will also be interested to know that in post change surveys of the customers affected, the approval rating has been over 80 per cent. Every time you get an 80 per cent approval rating you know you are doing the right thing.

Mr. Jim Jordan (Leeds—Grenville): Madam Speaker, if the minister would come clean on this I would try and understand. If he would tell me how many rural post offices closed I will work real hard on understanding.

Perhaps the minister should start to appreciate that not all Canadians live in Calgary, Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver. I know some who live in Westport, Marlbank, Seeleys Bay, Spencerville and Lombardy.

Constituents write and tell me it takes a general delivery letter four days to go 32 miles and three days for a letter to go 13 miles.

• (1445)

On behalf of all the people who live in rural and small town Canada, I want to ask the minister this: When is Canada Post going to start delivering the mail again in rural Canada?

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, I have to admit that he did ask a better question than some coming from his leader.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Andre: Perhaps the hon. member missed the part in the annual report where it is mentioned that on a quarterly basis Ernst and Young, an independent auditor, audits the on-time delivery of Canada Post mail, including from small town to small town, and the on-time delivery is 98 per cent.

The hon. member is making the same mistake he has made in terms of rural post offices. I said 80 per cent of the people affected approved of it. He said that he does not care, that he was worried about the 20 per cent. He says that he does not care that 99 per cent of the mail arrives on time, he is worried about the 1 per cent. He can worry about that 1 per cent, we are concerned with the 99 per cent.

* * *

STUDENT AID

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State.

Given that the public accounts committee, chaired by my colleague from Ottawa—Vanier, has shown the inadequacy of the current Student Assistance Program, that the 3 per cent tax on student loans should be removed as promised by the government, that the cost of living criteria for student allocations have not been adjusted since 1984, that students will be applying for student aid in August under old rules and an inadequate program, why is the government not bringing forth legislation that will correct these problems in the student aid program?

Why is the government not doing what it has promised to do for years now?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Monique Landry (Secretary of State of Canada): Madam Speaker, I think all members of this House will admit that over the years, the Canada Student Loans Program has done what it was supposed to do, which is to help an increasing number of students finish their education.

In his budget last year, the Minister of Finance announced a complete restructuring of the program in order to focus on two objectives. These were to enhance and increase support for students and thus give them a wider range of opportunities, but always within our budgetary limits. In fact, we are now finalizing the plan. I have had some fairly extensive consultations recently, and I believe that we will soon be able to announce certain improvements.

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, my supplementary is directed to the same minister. Why will the government not introduce this legislation? I do not understand. Is it afraid how the general public will react to the subsidies it will give the banks to manage the Student Loans Program or is the government afraid of the criteria for bank loans as they will be applied to students? Will it cancel the 3 per cent guarantee fee? Why will the government not act? There seems to be no good reason. This plan has been in the works for years.

Hon. Monique Landry (Secretary of State of Canada): Madam Speaker, the bill is being prepared, the requisite approvals have been given, and our negotiations with the banking community concerned how we would share the risk involved in student loans. Negotiations are at an advanced stage, we are very confident they will soon be finalized. I am sure the hon. member will appreciate the additional flexibility in this program, which will help students plan their week-to-week expenses, and also help those students with special needs. The hon. member will get some very good news shortly.

* * *

[*English*]

CRIME PREVENTION

Mrs. Louise Feltham (Wild Rose): Madam Speaker, two months ago the Minister of Justice held a symposium on community safety and crime prevention. The participants at the symposium called for quick action by the federal government in many areas pertaining to community safety.

I would like to ask the minister what progress he has made in following up on the recommendations made at the symposium.

• (1450)

Hon. Pierre Blais (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister of State (Agriculture)): Madam Speaker, as my hon. colleague knows, the gathering of close to 300 people in Toronto in March

from police forces, provincial governments, and federal departments, plus interest groups of the Elizabeth Fry Society and Bay Street and so on was a great success.

I think this will interest the members on the other side. Twenty-five to 30 people from that group are now working on a national strategy on crime prevention. It is very good to get those people together to help us to define the parameters to improve and to spend in a better way the money we have on crime prevention.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

Ms. Joy Langan (Mission—Coquitlam): Madam Speaker, I have here a copy of a confidential report produced in the winter of 1993 by the International Monetary Fund which I will be happy to table with the House.

This report was done in co-operation with the Minister of Finance and the Governor of the Bank of Canada, Mr. Crow. The report cites a figure of 8.75 per cent as the natural rate of unemployment in this country. This is apparently a figure accepted by this government as a benchmark for Tory economic policy making.

My question is a very simple one for the minister. Can he explain to this House what exactly natural unemployment rate is?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance): Madam Speaker, I have not seen the document to which the hon. member is referring.

If she wants to send it over to me I will take a look at it and see in what context it is being used. If the hon. member is asking me about the unemployment situation I can tell her very clearly that the current level of unemployment is too high as far as I am concerned.

We are taking every reasonable step possible and available to ensure that that is turned around. It starts with low interest rates, low inflation, getting the fundamentals right and fiscal consolidation along with the kinds of adjustment programs necessary to facilitate the restructuring to ensure that we can continue to be competitive, productive and a major exporting nation.

That is exactly what is happening. That is why we are seeing growth in the goods producing sector and that is why we are going to see jobs and more jobs.

Ms. Joy Langan (Mission—Coquitlam): Madam Speaker, I find it fascinating that the Minister of Finance would suggest that he does not know that the current use of the term natural rate of unemployment is that the government is accepting the lowest level that can be expected in Canada.

At a recently held conference hosted by the institute for research on public policy attended by senior government representatives and academics it became clear that the government is comfortable with a natural rate of unemployment in the range of 7 per cent to 8 per cent. The entrenchment of a high rate of unemployment is seen by this government as a good thing to establish its policies and to keep inflation down.

My question is this. How can this government willingly embrace and promote the misery of almost a million unemployed Canadians by establishing a policy that has an 8 per cent unemployment rate being okay? Is it just going to wipe out the unemployment line like it did the poverty line?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance): Madam Speaker, the hon. member is incorrect in her assumptions.

If she would look at page 40 of the budget that was tabled in April 1993 she would find that we are projecting an unemployment rate of 7.5 per cent average in the period 1995-98.

* * *

FISHERIES

Mr. Francis G. LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries.

It is now three weeks since the minister of fisheries announced details of his so-called adjustment measures for Atlantic fishermen and plant workers. These same fishermen and plant workers are still being forced to endure endless and arbitrary delays by this minister and his department in implementing what is already a meagre aid package.

Fishermen cannot fish. Quotas have been cut by 70 per cent. In the month of May no less than three 10-day closures were imposed in the gulf because of small fish. Many fishermen are in their fourth week without any income.

Will the minister finally admit that this situation is a *de facto* moratorium and come forward now with an appropriate and more substantial aid package?

• (1455)

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency): Madam Speaker, there is no moratorium of course on the fishery in the area that the hon. gentleman mentions. There was an—

Mr. Milliken: What about a *de facto*?

Mr. Peterson: Kim doesn't agree with you.

Mr. Crosbie: The hon. gentleman opposite is not from a fishing area and he does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. MacKay: But he flounders around a lot. Knock him off his perch, John.

Mr. Crosbie: He is a bit of a flounderer, my deskmate says.

Mr. MacKay: Give him a fair herring, John.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Madam Deputy Speaker: I know that quite a few other members want to ask questions. I think we may gain a lot by having questions shorter and the answer shorter.

Mr. Francis G. LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is not for the fisheries minister, the fourth we have seen in the last nine years of this government, but to the Deputy Prime Minister in the absence of the Prime Minister.

Like so many other fields of activity in which it has been engaged, this dying government is leaving the Atlantic fishery in a shambles. As he prepares to leave office, along with the Prime Minister, will the Deputy Prime Minister explain to this House how he intends to justify this monumental failure by his government to manage one of Canada's most vital industries?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency): Madam Speaker, we certainly realize that this is partisan rhetoric because in the long history of Canada there has never been a period of 18 months where a government committed $1.2 billion to meet a situation in the fishery not caused by the government but caused primarily by environmental conditions that have affected fish stocks; $1.2 billion, including $191 million in the Atlantic adjustment program that the hon. member opposite is scoffing at now. In the long history of Canada it is the greatest amount of assistance to fishermen ever.

* * *

CANADA-NOVA SCOTIA AGRICULTURE AGREEMENT

Mr. Pat Nowlan (Annapolis Valley—Hants): Madam Speaker, my question is for the minister of fisheries but it is not on fish. It is in respect to his position in terms of ACOA. Could he please seriously bring us up to date on the status of the Canada-Nova Scotia food agricultural agreement in which so many projects are on hold until we sort out a few problems?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency): Madam Speaker, I am glad on this occasion to answer a question from a former leadership candidate in our party as a former leadership candidate myself and I believe we are both supporting the same candidate at this particular convention.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Crosbie: Madam Speaker, with reference to the agricultural matters that the hon. gentleman refers to, and he is often of course standing in agricultural matter himself, we are hoping to straighten out the matter of a renewal of an agricultural agreement with Nova Scotia in the next several weeks. There have to be some adjustments as a result of the budget. All members of the House are against the deficit, including the Leader of the Opposition. We are against the deficit. I had to deal with that situation because I am against the deficit and when it is all over we will know who is for the deficit and who is against the deficit and whether or not we can enter into such an agreement.

AGRICULTURE

Hon. Ralph Ferguson (Lambton—Middlesex): Madam Speaker, this week the Government of France made some concessions relating to the oilseeds production that have been regarded as a major breakthrough in GATT negotiations.

Recently a very well informed appointed member of the other place stated that a GATT agreement would be forthcoming from the G-7 summit meeting in Tokyo in July. This same Tory senator stated that we will see the demise of marketing boards in Canada and that they will be replaced by tariffication.

• (1500)

Will the government tell us when it changed its position? Why is it changing its position? Why is it giving up on article 11(2)(c) when the United States is moving toward a system of planned production in its dairy industry?

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Industry, Science and Technology and Minister for International Trade): Madam Speaker, we have not changed the position. The position remains the same as it has always been, the unified position on Canadian agriculture that has been supported by all sides of the agriculture sector. That is to protect the marketing boards system and to seek a strengthening clarification of article 11(2)(c).

My hon. friend is quite aware of that position and I know that he supports it as well.

* * *

TRANSFER PAYMENTS

Hon. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton—Melville): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance.

Yesterday the Minister of the Environment in his capacity as a leadership candidate said that he would like to cut some $8 billion from transfer payments to the provinces which is contrary to what the Minister of Finance has said from time to time.

I know that the Minister of National Defence has said that the Minister of the Environment has never had a substantive portfolio in this government. In spite of that, does the Minister of Finance want to get up in the House and repudiate the Minister of the Environment, stand by his budget and not—

Madam Deputy Speaker: The hon. member who is an experienced member knows that this is not a receivable question.

* * *

[*Translation*]

GUN CONTROL

Mr. Guy Saint-Julien (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Justice. In Nova Scotia, the Liberal government wants to exempt gun clubs in the province from Bill C-17 by allowing target practice with para-military and semi-automatic firearms with large-capacity cartridge magazines. These are dangerous weapons, however.

My question is this: could the minister explain why the Liberal government of Nova Scotia issues exemptions in violation of the Criminal Code?

Hon. Pierre Blais (Minister of Justice, Attorney General of Canada and Minister of State (Agriculture)): Madam Speaker, the hon. member may recall that last year, Parliament delegated authority for designating and identifying shooting competitions to the attorneys general of the provinces. It is therefore up to the provinces to make such identification.

I hope there will be some form of standardization in the way this is done. I know that Nova Scotia's decision has been criticized. I will monitor this very closely with my officials. I am waiting to see how the other provinces will react as well, but I am monitoring the situation.

* * *

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT

Mr. David Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond): Madam Speaker, I want to ask the government House leader to confirm the business for the remaining part of today, which I understand will be on Bill C-126, and whether or not we will be proceeding to Bill C-103 and thereafter Bill C-106. Can he confirm that.

Would he also confirm for members of the House as to what the business will be next week. As I understand it, he intends to proceed with the report stage and third reading on Monday and Tuesday of Bill C-110, namely the fixed link. It is my understanding that on Wednesday he will proceed with an adjournment motion at 3 p.m. Can he confirm that for members of the House?

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, the House leader of the Liberal Party has it all right except the precise time of the adjournment motion next Wednesday.

I would like to discuss with House leaders opposite in terms of what business might be conducted on Wednesday. It would be our hope to move the adjournment debate that day.

* * *

NORTHUMBERLAND STRAIT CROSSING ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Mr. Speaker, an agreement could not be reached under the provisions of Standing Order 78(1) or (2) with respect to report stage and third reading of Bill C-110, an act respecting the Northumberland Strait Crossing, and under the provisions of Standing Order (78(3), I give notice of my intention to move a time allocation motion at the next sitting of the House for the purpose of allotting a specified number of days or hours for the consideration and disposal of proceedings at the said stages.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT

Mr. David Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond): Madam Speaker, the government House leader indicated that it will be his intention some time on Wednesday to proceed with an adjournment motion. Perhaps that will have to be done on Thursday or Friday. I did not hear specifically. Maybe he wants to negotiate this further.

With regard to Bill C-128, the pornography bill, which as you know our critic in the Liberal Party is supporting, we were wondering whether or not the government can give any indication as to the time frame in which it wishes to bring this bill forward so that we can proceed on this expeditiously.

• (1505)

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): That is certainly one of the bills on which it is my understanding the work of the committee is going on successfully. There is a fair degree of unanimity. It would certainly be my intention that once committee work is completed on that to talk to colleagues opposite to see whether in fact it is desirable to proceed with completion of that bill before the summer adjournment.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS—SPEAKER'S RULING

Madam Deputy Speaker: I am now ready to rule on the matter raised by the hon. member for Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte on Friday, June 4, 1993. I was hoping the hon. member would be in the House. He was told but unfortunately he was not here yesterday and he is not here today.

In his submission, the hon. member stated that in one of the lobbies just before Question Period he received a letter from the solicitors of Mr. Tim Ralfe giving notice of their intention to reserve the right to bring action for libel against the hon. member. The letter, which I have examined, demands that a full and unconditional apology and retraction be delivered by the hon. member for a verbal and written statement about Mr. Ralfe which the letter claims was made by the hon. member outside the precinct of Parliament on June 3, 1993. It is the contention of the hon. member for Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte that the receipt of this letter in the precincts of the House constitutes a question of privilege. He has argued that the action of Mr. Ralfe and his solicitors and the apparent familiarity of the government House leader with the letter constitutes an attempt to intimidate him and prevent him from performing his duties.

I have reviewed the situation re-examining what was said during Question Period and during the discussion of this matter. I would like to take this opportunity to thank those hon. members who made interventions.

[*Translation*]

As the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell pointed out, there are two questions to be answered to determine if this should be considered a *prima facie* question of privilege. Has there been an attempt to intimidate a member in the exercise of his duties? Were legal documents served or delivered in the precincts of Parliament, in particular one of the lobbies, without the Speaker's express permission?

[*English*]

Joseph Maingot in *Parliamentary Privilege in Canada*, page 96, states:

> While it is clear that the member is afforded absolute privilege in law for acts done and words said during a parliamentary proceeding, he speaks outside the House at his peril without the protection of parliamentary privilege. In these same circumstances, however, he is afforded the protection of the common law like anyone else to the extent that it would apply.

While it is the Speaker's duty to maintain decorum in the House, the Speaker, as servant of the House, does not have the power to instigate disciplinary action against a member for actions taken or words spoken outside the Chamber of the House. What a member says outside the House about anyone is subject to the laws of the land relating to libel or slander as it would be for any other Canadian—if indeed the comments are actionable. What members say in the Chamber, however, is protected by privilege. Thus if the situation is as described in the letter to the hon. member for Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte, then this cannot be considered a question of privilege and it is therefore not up to the Speaker to intervene.

[*Translation*]

There is a long-standing tradition that process cannot be served in the precincts of the House of Commons. The Chair has always maintained that such service of process would be improper without the permission of the Speaker. As regards civil matters, this was forcefully reiterated in a Speaker's ruling of May 19, 1989.

• (1510)

[*English*]

Having carefully examined the letter received by the hon. member from the solicitors of Mr. Ralfe, the Chair must conclude that it does not fall under the definition of process implicit in the notion of which is issuance from a court of law. It is clear from the text of the letter that no legal proceedings have been begun and delivery of the letter was not a service of process. The letter could just as well have been sent through the mails as delivered by hand. There was no requirement to inform the Speaker, nor are there any grounds for the Chair to intervene in this matter.

For these reasons this situation does not meet the criteria of a prima facie question of privilege. I thank the hon. member.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

AMENDMENT OF AUTHORIZATION OF SUBCOMMITTEE TO TRAVEL

Mr. Charles A. Langlois (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and to the Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I think you will find consent in the House for the following motion:

> That the motion of May 26, 1993 authorizing the Subcommittee on Development and Human Rights of the Standing Committee of External Affairs and International Trade to travel to Vienna be amended by changing the dates to read June 11 to June 26, 1993.

Mr. David Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, my colleague is correct. There have been some consultations among the different parties of the House and we wish to give our consent.

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops): Mr. Speaker, in light of fact we had already earlier approved this most important issue, we would like to update the visiting time and indicate our support.

Motion agreed to.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Blais that Bill C-126, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Young Offenders Act, be read the third time and passed.

Ms. Dawn Black (New Westminster—Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, I want to complete my remarks with some of the stories of women who have written to me on this issue. They capture the need for a strong and effective anti-stalking law.

One woman had been stalked for eight years and she said:

> Being watched, followed, assaulted, vandalized, robbed, threatened with your life, harassed at school and at work is not romantic. It is a violation of one's rights and freedoms.

She also said:

> All the orders in the world could not help, because the police were reluctant to arrest him, and when they did, the judges let him go with very mild sentences.

She had to leave home and go into hiding. She said she was forced to live the existence of a criminal on the run while the real criminal enjoyed freedom. She said:

> A person has to be seriously hurt, maimed or killed before anything can be done to get the stalker off the streets—Laws have existed all along. They are not being used to their fullest degree—Even if the accused is a repeat offender, and there is a jail term, they only do half the time—When they do get out, they come out angry. Usually there is a plan for continued or more aggressive harassment.

With the bill before us the problem of lenient sentences remains. Repeat offenders and those who break court orders can still just get probation or one month in jail to be served on weekends.

Our courts do not take assault and sexual assault seriously. Why should they take this criminal harassment law seriously?

In another case a woman left her husband who physically, sexually and emotionally abused her. He threatened to kidnap her daughter. He had access to the daughter. Every time he came over he would threaten to beat up his ex-wife. He phoned her at all hours and said nothing or he threatened her. He told her he would get a gun and blow her head off. He had a court order not to contact her. He phoned to threaten her and then he came over. She phoned the police but it took a further phone call and 45 minutes before they arrived. He was charged and found guilty but only given probation. She has since received three death threats in the mail. To this day even hearing the phone ring makes her feel ill.

The Manitoba government made representation before the committee studying the bill. In the five recent stalking cases that it outlined all the harassers broke restraining orders and there was no great penalty for them in doing so. Women have died because of a lack of protection, because of a lack of a strong law, because of an inconsistent enforcement of our current laws, and because of the attitudes in our society that produce these particular men who try to control women. Unfortunately the government has not accepted strong penalties for repeat offenders and those who break restraining orders.

• (1515)

The state of Virginia has a minimum six-year sentence for a third offence of stalking. What I proposed was a minimum six-month sentence for a second offence of stalking which is the same as a second offence penalty for drunk driving.

I am very pleased to support the child witness and anti-child abuse provisions of the bill. I also support a strong and effective anti-stalking bill. I am sorry this bill is not as strong or as clear as I had hoped it would be. We still support the bill. We think that this is one small step forward out of a series of steps that must be taken to eradicate violence against women.

I will conclude by congratulating the real heroes of the day: all those who work in shelters for battered women, who work with abused children, who work in community groups and women's groups to educate the public about these issues. They are the reason we are talking about this today. They deserve our deepest thanks and utmost respect.

Mr. Jim Karpoff (Surrey North): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to make a few comments on this piece of legislation and to get the reflections of my colleague from New Westminster—Burnaby on it.

A great deal of the impetus for the bill belongs to the hard work of the member for New Westminister—Burnaby. She initiated a private member's bill that was clear and succinct in setting out what was wanted by women across the country. I sent out some information to my riding in a letter outlining the purpose of the bill and

asking people to indicate their support. Much to my surprise I received 2,500 letters supporting that private member's bill. That is much greater than any other type of mail-back I have received in my nearly five years in the House. I can understand why, as it is a problem women in particular have faced for years.

I have worked in family courts. I have worked in social services. I have known many women who have been criminally harassed and stalked. Within my extended family we have a young woman who was harassed, stalked or followed. She actually moved from one city to another and still was seriously assaulted because the stalker appeared to be immune.

I had the privilege of sitting in on the committee hearings for a couple of days. I heard women give evidence about their problems. Their lives were not only terrorized but were put in total disarray by somebody repeatedly phoning them. Even after changing their phone numbers it took only two days for the men to get the new phone numbers.

Men contacted their family physicians and actually got information. These men contacted their relatives and employers. Whenever the women went out of their houses to their places of employment the men were there. Clearly these men were interested in controlling the women. They put the women's lives in turmoil. They wanted to control and exercise power over them. It was not always that they exercised it in terms of threats. They often veiled their power by saying that they wanted to help them, that they wanted to be with them and that they loved them.

During committee consideration it became obvious there was a need for this type of legislation. The committee worked hard and made many improvements. There are some things I regret the committee refused to address.

I want to mention just one or two of them. One was that there should have been a minimum sentence for repeat offenders or people who continued to harass where there was a court order or a restraining order prohibiting them from doing so. To not have a minimum sentence makes it a mockery. Another area I would liked to have seen dealt with is the matter of education.

• (1520)

Does the member for New Westminster—Burnaby feel there will be another opportunity in the near future to bring back the legislation to deal with two major flaws? One is the minimum sentence and the other is the education of police, the judiciary and judges.

Ms. Black: Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from Surrey North for his support when I was drafting my private members' bill and his support for the legislation within my own caucus and outside in his community.

Without the understanding of both men and women as parliamentarians and both men and women in society about the real tragedy of this kind of harassment and terrorism, I do not think we can make the progress we need to make.

He talked about two provisions that I also feel very strongly about. The matter of education of the police officials, Crown prosecutors and the judges is something I and others have certainly been talking about in this place for close to the five years we have been here. We have been pushing for mandatory gender sensitivity education. Over and over again we see inappropriate, ill-informed and sexist comments from the top, from the judges, in terms of the reality of women's lives and experiences. I do not believe it will change until we make a concerted effort in that area.

In Australia it has been done. The former Minister of Justice who is now running to be leader of the Conservative Party has said in the House it is impossible to do so, that we have to respect the integrity of the judges. That is nonsense. It has been done in Australia. It can be done. It needs to be done.

On the issue of penalties within this bill I feel disappointed because in talking to people within the court system and women themselves, they have told me of cases over and over again where a man has been served with a restraining order and right there in the court room in front of the officials, the judges, the Crown prosecutors and the lawyers, he takes the restraining order and says: "This is not worth the paper it is printed on and I am going to get you". Unfortunately he is right. It is not worth the paper it is printed on under our current system. I wish we had minimum penalties in

this regard. I wish we had a more severe penalty for repeat offenders.

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, it is pleasure to speak at third reading of the bill. It is a very important bill, particularly for all women and children. Not only is it relating to stalking but it relates to a lot of the problems being experienced by children who are witnesses in court and who are subject to sexual offences. There is a good deal in the bill that has to be addressed. That is why my party and I feel it is important the bill be passed.

It is very unfortunate the process has been rushed. It would have been much better had the government allowed proper time for dialogue on this important question. It has not. I do not think it is a bad bill as a result. I want to say it is largely because of the work of the legislative committee that this is the case, particularly the work of the members from Halifax and Moncton who did a good deal work for our party on this bill and other members from other parties as well.

• (1525)

I want to say that in dealing with legislation it is important to have dialogue. There has been criticism of this legislation and I think it has been justified. There are a lot of national groups in Canada that have been working very hard on women's and children's issues. They were not consulted before this bill was formulated.

That is wrong. It is not a question of looking to determine what any particular group can add. People working in these circumstances and dealing with the problems we want to address in the legislation should be contacted.

The member for New Westminster—Burnaby mentioned the real heroes regarding this bill. We are talking about people who have worked on children's problems and violence against women. They have known about the phenomenon of stalking for years. They have watched thousands of women suffer through the terror of being stalked.

These front line workers are the real experts in this field. However their expertise was overlooked by the government in its rush to pass this piece of pre-election legislation.

This is unfortunate particularly when the Minister of Justice said in a letter to METRAC: "The government of which I am a member believes in the value of consultations with stakeholders in an issue". That is directly contrary to the practice of the government.

On last year's bill dealing with the rape shield, Bill C-49, there was consultation. I think that as a result there was more of a consensus when the bill was introduced in the House.

I would hope that the government will consult in the future, which means all of three sitting days of the House in this Parliament. It might consult with only one or two people but it is a beginning. Unfortunately it will not have the chance to perfect it beyond that modest beginning. That is the way it is. If those members cannot learn in nine years the chances of them learning now or in the future seem rather remote.

This bill has been improved as a result of the legislative committee process. I want to talk about some of the amendments that have been put forward and passed. One is that there is no longer a need for prosecutors to prove that a pursuer had a specific intent to harass his victim.

The legislation now says that prosecutors need prove only that a stalker acts "knowing that another person is harassed". I think that is important. To emphasize it I want to use the words of one of the witnesses who gave very good testimony, Mr. Stewart Whitley, the assistant deputy attorney general for the province of Manitoba.

The words he used are very important. They set it out very well. He says: "From the legal framework point of view, it is our view that the bill need only prohibit the conduct that we are attempting to discourage. We are indifferent to the man's intent. If A throws a bottle at B and hits C, he is not relieved from criminal liability simply because he has been heard to say: 'I did not intend to harm that person'. The intent requisite for assault is sufficient to make out the crime of assault. Why is it not good enough for stalking?" That is very important. We have made a major improvement here and I want to congratulate the committee.

The test for reasonable fear has also been amended. Originally a person had to reasonably fear for her safety before a charge could be laid. The bill now refers to a reasonable fear for safety taking into account "all of the circumstances". That is a major improvement.

• (1530)

As well, it may seem insignificant to some but I think it is very important, a conviction for criminal harassment will be added to the list of reasons for a judge to invoke a firearms prohibition. That is very significant.

It is also significant that the child protection provisions have been amended to prohibit convicted child abusers from volunteering with organizations that would give them authority over children. Originally the bill prohibited only employment with such organizations. However we know that a lot of the opportunities for child abuse happen as a result of voluntary organizations, not as a result of employment. It is important that has been added.

It is also important that we have also increased the sentence with respect to removing a young person from Canada. Section 273.3, subsection 1, says:

> No person shall do anything for the purpose of removing from Canada a person who is ordinarily resident in Canada and who is—

It goes on to talk about the various categories of young people and offences pertinent to those age categorizations. Originally in the bill the maximum sentence was two years. We have increased that from two years to five years. It is a very serious offence and therefore it is very important that we have a stricter penalty.

I also want to say that we have to be mindful that even though we have an act which is a major step forward there is so much more to do. I do not necessarily mean with respect to legislation. I am hopeful that this legislation will do what is intended by members of the House and by the government. If we took a lot of time we could make changes that might add to the significance and effectiveness of this bill. However we do not have that kind of time. The House is close to adjourning. We have a bill which is a major step forward and which we need to pass.

If we do not pass this legislation and a woman who has been stalked and harassed is murdered over the summer months or in the immediate months which follow then this House of Commons would have to seriously look at itself. This is a concern that is becoming more and more prevalent among the people in Canada. As we heard from one of the witnesses during the committee hearings, stalking is just one step on the continuum of violence against women.

We have to stop the harassment behaviour of the stalker before it escalates into serious physical harm or death, and this all too often happens in stalking cases.

It is also important to think of the words of the attorney general of Ontario who said: "Stalking is about the denial of some of the most fundamental rights of every person in a free and democratic society". That is important because if we deny the woman the right to be free from stalking we are sentencing that person to perhaps years of incredible terror and persecution.

We have heard cases of women who have been stalked for not a month or a year but 10 or 12 years. A woman will constantly not know when she goes to the supermarket if the person stalking her will be in that aisle, whether he will jump out at her from behind a tree, whether she will receive roses from that person just to let her know that he is still there and watching her or whether he will leave a message on the seat of her car. This terror day after day has to end for the women of Canada. They have to be able to have the peace and security that all citizens want for them.

• (1535)

We heard excellent testimony from the women's groups. Dr. Glenda Simms, the president of the Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women, said: "Violence against women is systematic in nature and requires a systematic response. Legislation itself is inadequate. Our society will not have any success in eliminating the kind of behaviour targeted in this bill if we do not also ensure that those involved in the criminal justice system better understand violence against women and the equality issues".

That is important because one of the things we have to do to reduce stalking after we pass this legislation is to work with our judicial system, our judiciary, and our police forces to ensure that we are giving them the information and assistance they need. We have heard cases in which women have said that the police did not feel their cries for help were legitimate. The police thought they were over-reacting. We heard of judges who felt that what the stalker did was not out of the ordinary. This thinking has to be changed. We have to

sensitize our police and our judiciary to the actual concern and immediacy of this stalking dilemma.

I think the police and the judiciary are well prepared for any kind of help and information we can give to them. I hope that courses and instruction will follow to the necessary degree. I hope that police academies, for instance, will deal with these very real concerns that women have in our society today.

Dr. Simms went on to testify: "Although women's organizations would welcome any measure that offers real protection to abused women no national women's group has identified an urgent need for this law. Why not? In part because we know how difficult it is to persuade police and prosecutors to enforce the law we do have. The problems go beyond the quality of our laws to attitudes in the criminal justice system and inadequate funding for protection".

We must listen to those comments. We must listen to the feeling by women's groups that the police, judiciary and criminal justice system do not fully appreciate the concerns women have.

We also must appreciate the fact that funding has to be present. In Quebec, and I mentioned this at second reading, women's shelters for abused women were advertised. They offered these services to these women. The response was so great that it overloaded the system and there were not the facilities to handle and take care of the women who needed the assistance and so they withdrew the commercials from the media. That is a sad commentary but the fact is that funding is a very important aspect.

I want to deal with another very important point that was made by Lee Lakeman of the National Action Committee on the Status of Women. She said: "In the consultations the National Action Committee has been able to do with front line workers we find that the major problem facing women victims of repeated obsessive harassment is that neither the police nor the courts believe that the threats are serious. Often they do not believe that the threats have happened".

• (1540)

I think people will say: "That is not true. How can our courts and our police forces really believe this?" We have heard from two major national women's organizations in this country that that concern is very real. If that concern is put forward by both groups in almost the same language then I think it is important for the criminal justice system in this country to listen.

We have to listen to it and we have to make sure that we follow this up. We must not leave this whole question with the passage of this bill. We must proceed with the follow up. We must remove the terror from the women who are being stalked in this country and assaulted and in many cases killed by the stalkers. These are not people in most cases with whom they are unfamiliar. These are former husbands and boyfriends. The fact of the matter is that the law might have been there to a certain degree, but this bill makes it stronger.

We as members of Parliament have an obligation to see that this legislation is passed because it is a major step forward.

Mr. Jesse Flis (Parkdale—High Park): Mr. Speaker, I am listening very carefully to all of the interventions about women being stalked and so on. It is abhorrent, but I have not heard anyone speaking about women being harassed with children or where the women and children are being harassed at the same time.

As a former principal of many schools this used to be a constant problem. The wife would run away with the children to another province to hide from her husband. I had a case where a woman ran away from Winnipeg to Toronto. The husband would find the children in the school yard and the children would be brought to the principal's office in terror.

Is the bill addressing the women who have this double problem? It is not only the women being stalked themselves but the children being stalked at the same time?

Mr. MacLellan: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the bill does address this. The previous situation was that a woman who was in terror for her safety and perhaps even her life and who took her children with her when she fled the family home could be accused of having taken the children away and fleeing illegally and be subject to court action for taking the children away unlawfully.

The fact is that this bill recognizes that when a woman leaves in terror for her own safety, and in many cases it is the safety of her children, that she is not going to abandon her children. She is going to take her children with her. That is very important.

I want to thank the member for Parkdale—High Park for bringing this point forward. It is a very important point. It does recognize the bond between the mother and the children and the fact that the children cannot be excluded from the agony of this situation.

* * *

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed the following bills without amendment: Bill C-132, an act to establish a territory to be known as Nunavut and provide for its government and to amend certain acts in consequence thereof; Bill C-133, an act respecting an agreement between the Inuit of the Nunavut settlement area and Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada; and Bill C-134, an act for granting Her Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of Canada for the financial year ending March 31, 1994.

* * *

• (1545)

THE ROYAL ASSENT

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order. I have the honour to inform the House that a communication has been received as follows:

Mr. Speaker,

I have the honour to inform you that the Honourable Beverly McLachlin, Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, in her capacity as Deputy Governor General, will proceed to the Senate chamber today, the 10th day of June, 1993, at 3.45 p.m., for the purpose of giving the royal assent to certain bills.

Yours sincerely,

Judith LaRocque,
Secretary to the Governor General

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Blais, that Bill C-126, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Young Offenders Act, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Rob Nicholson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister of State (Agriculture)): Mr. Speaker, I have just a follow up on the matter raised by the member for Parkdale—High Park.

The hon. member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys pointed out the new provisions which concerns usually a woman taking her children when she believes they face imminent harm. I should also point out that in the stalking section itself one of the ways that criminal harassment can take place is if the threatening conduct is not directed just at the individual in question but any other member of their family. That would bring the children within the scope of the bill. I just thought I would make that comment.

Mr. Dan Heap (Trinity—Spadina): Mr. Speaker, I may not take the 10 minutes because what I have to say is fairly simple.

First I want to commend members on all sides of this House who have done a very large amount of work on this bill. As has been agreed on all sides, it could be better but it is best for it to go through now and it can be improved in further years.

There is a great weight of evidence that has been brought forward in the committee and sampled in the House about the need for Bill C-126 to defend against stalking. I admit that I was surprised at first at the expressed need for this bill although it is clear enough even from the daily newspapers and from phone calls to my office that something like this is needed. I asked myself if this was a change or if this something that was not needed before. I would say that it is not entirely so.

In the past, domestic violence, as it was often classified, was very rarely a subject of a court action and very rarely punished. The attitude was that it would be handled within the family. Many women in the past

spent more time within what was called the home and if there was violence there the police and the courts rarely intervened. Also for obvious reasons, in the past, women may not have complained when they perhaps in hindsight had reason to complain. What has happened in part is that a situation has been brought to light and brought to Parliament and Parliament has begun to deal with it in this act.

There is a further reason why this law should be coming now rather than 10, 20, 30 or 40 years ago. There has been a change and it is the rising status of women in the Canadian economy, society and politics. This includes Parliament. There are more women now in the work force.

So they are out. They are in one sense more exposed or more vulnerable to such a thing as stalking. On the other hand, the stalking becomes more visible and more obvious and more capable of being dealt with than perhaps it was before.

• (1550)

More women are now able in one way or another to act without their husbands. For example, when my wife and I were married in Quebec in 1950 we were advised by a friendly lawyer to get a marriage contract.

Otherwise by the then Quebec laws my wife would be considered a minor even though she is the same age as I am. She would pass from the tutelage of her father to the tutelage of her husband. She would not be able to sign a cheque if somebody challenged the fact that it was the signature of a minor, let alone conduct business or own property.

Although we had no money I was persuaded to settle a vast amount of money and property on her so that if she ever had to act alone she would have a sound legal basis for doing it under the 1950 laws in Quebec. Of course those laws have been long since repealed. They have been replaced with much more modern laws.

That is part of the change in our society. I remember about 35 years ago when a work mate—a man working in the factory where I then worked—remarked that it was too bad that a woman can just walk out of the house and leave her husband and get a job. Clearly he felt that the old days were better when she was forced to stay home in order to eat because she could not get a job as there were not that many jobs for women. In the then modern circumstances of the late 1950s there were so many jobs that a woman could just leave her husband and walk out. My friend thought that was really quite terrible. I think he has updated his ideas since then. He and his wife are both together but I do not think he would say now what he said then.

I have given some extreme examples. What has been happening is that men at the present time tend to resent the fact of women attaining equality before the law, in employment, in social status and in social positions. I do not say that they have attained complete equality—far from it—but they have been moving up. Some men find that very hard to take. I

I want to say that it is a good law because it reflects a change for the better in our society. I do not mean the stalking is better but it is the change that has brought the stalking either into the light or into greater prominence. The rise in the status of women is in itself a good change.

This law will enable that change to go further still. I congratulate those especially on the committee from all parties who have worked on this law. I look forward to it being very useful to the people in Trinity—Spadina and to those in the rest of Canada.

Mrs. Beryl Gaffney (Nepean): Mr. Speaker, I too am pleased to stand in this House today to speak to Bill C–126, which is a bill that would make a criminal offence of harassment or stalking.

Although this bill is flawed it has my support. The proposed provisions of this bill prohibit anyone from repeatedly communicating with or following another person, any member of their family and anyone known to that person.

Such stalking would include persistently following someone, spending extended periods of time watching someone's home or place of work, making harassing telephone calls and making contact with one's neighbours or friends.

Section 423 prohibits intimidation which is generally defined as using violence or threats of violence against someone or their spouse or children, following or watching someone for the purpose of compelling them not to do something they have a lawful right to do or compelling them to do something they have a lawful right not to do.

This section is generally recognized as being inadequate because offences are hard to prove.

• (1555)

I was pleased to see that clause 2, section 264.1 was changed. Intent to harass was removed because intention is much harder to prove. It was replaced with "knowingly or recklessly" which is a lower standard of proof. This should make it easier to secure a conviction with a lower standard of proof.

Section 264.2 was amended to add all the circumstances. The reason for this is that it takes into account the circumstances of the woman. It provides context. The standard becomes more subjective as opposed to the objective that causes another person—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member. I think we have a message from the Senate.

* * *

[*Translation*]

ROYAL ASSENT

A message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod as follows:

> Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Deputy to the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this honourable House in the chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, the Speaker with the House went up to the Senate chamber.

• (1605)

And being returned:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): I have the honour to inform the House that when the House went up to the Senate Chamber, the Deputy Governor General was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the royal assent to the following bills:

> Bill C-92, an act to amend the Income Tax Act, the Canada Pension Plan, the Income Tax Conventions Interpretation Act, the Tax Rebate Discounting Act, the Unemployment Insurance Act and certain related acts—Chapter No. 24;
>
> Bill C-102, an act to amend the Customs Tariff, the Excise Act, the Excise Tax Act, the Customs Act, the Criminal Code and a related act—Chapter No. 25;
>
> Bill C-118, an act to amend the Export Development Act—Chapter No. 26;
>
> Bill C-112, an act to amend the Excise Tax Act, the Access to Information Act, the Canada Pension Plan, the Customs Act, the Federal Court Act, the Income Tax Act, the Tax Court of Canada Act, the Tax Rebate Discounting Act, the Unemployment Insurance Act and a related act—Chapter No. 27;
>
> Bill C-132, an act to establish a territory to be known as Nunavut and provide for its government and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof—Chapter No. 28;
>
> Bill C-133, an act respecting an agreement between the Inuit of the Nunavut Settlement Area and Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada—Chapter No. 29; and
>
> Bill C-134, an act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of Canada for the financial year ending 31st March, 1994—Chapter No. 30.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Cape Breton—East Richmond—The Economy; the hon. member for Don Valley East—Air India; the hon. member for Bonavista—Trinity—Conception—Armed Forces; the hon. member for Halifax—National Defence, and the hon. member for St. Boniface—Employment.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1610)

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Blais, that Bill C-126, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Young Offenders Act, be read the third time and passed.

Mrs. Beryl Gaffney (Nepean): Mr. Speaker, section 264(2) was amended to add all the circumstances. The reason for doing this is that it takes into account the circumstances of the woman. It provides context. The standard becomes more subjective as opposed to objective:

> that causes that other person reasonably to fear

By recognizing that women's experience and perceptions are different than those of men, this amendment would be used to substantiate the reasonableness of the victim's fear.

I am pleased that Bill C-126 proposes harsher penalties for this type of offence. Increasing the possible penalty for this offence to a maximum of five years in prison sends a strong message that stalking will no longer be tolerated. In fact zero tolerance of harassment must be our common goal and action.

Clause 7, section 465 was amended to add a section on husband-wife conspiracy with regard to the abduction of a child. This amendment was voted down in committee because it would not take into account the situation, financial dependence, fear of assault, battered wife syndrome, et cetera of women who are often forced into such acts. There is often a power imbalance between partners that must be acknowledged by law. Such an amendment would not have recognized that in many relationships women have neither control nor power.

I was pleased with the parental child abduction provisions. At present children are not protected from abduction where there is a valid custody order but the abducting parent believes it to be invalid. This bill redresses this situation and closes this gap by stating that:

> A person is guilty of an indictable offence or an offence punishable on summary conviction if this parent abducts a child whether or not there is a custody order with relation to that person.

This is a long overdue measure.

Clause 9 of the bill was amended to prohibit accused persons from possessing firearms, ammunition and explosive substances. The accused must also surrender firearms acquisition certificates. This refers to clause 8, subsection 515 (4.1) and is designed to give added protection to the victims. In other words, in addition to not being able to communicate with the victims and frequent certain places, the accused will no longer be allowed to possess firearms.

I also support the amendment proposed by my colleague from Moncton that the House undertake a comprehensive review of the provisions of this act. This is imperative to ensure that the act, if and when implemented, is meeting the needs of Canadian society.

I am concerned by the provisions with respect to convicted sex offenders and their access to children. The new provision that would provide for up to a lifetime ban on convicted sex offenders from frequenting day care centres, school grounds, play grounds or community centres, public parks, bathing areas and so on is problematic. Although it allows the court the discretion to tailor the prohibition to the circumstances of the individual or not to impose the prohibition at all, it leaves the individual judge with far too much discretion.

The premise is also very disturbing. The premises are linked in that a person who commits an offence should be punished for life and a person who commits a certain type of offence will inevitably do the same thing. It is an entirely different story with a repeat offender who refuses all treatment. My party, the Liberal Party, believes that the rehabilitation of an offender is a fundamental premise of our criminal justice system. Retribution without rehabilitation is a very flawed process.

Several weeks ago I participated in a press conference with the Liberal leader to unveil the Liberal crime and justice paper. In the paper we proposed recommendations to deal with the rehabilitation of sexual offenders. Over the past five years there has been a 20.4 per cent increase in the rate of admission of sex offenders. This means that more and more sex offenders are reintegrating into Canadian communities.

As the research branch of the Correctional Service of Canada tells us, repeat sex offenders are more than twice as likely to commit further sex offences, much more likely to violate conditional release conditions and more likely than any other offenders to re-offend with a non-sexual offence. Unfortunately treatment programs for sexual offenders are lacking. The federal government is spending approximately $98 million a year to incarcerate these offenders and only $2 million a year on treatment programs. It is the norm when it should be the exception that convicted offenders are returned to their communities without counselling or rehabilitation therapy. Treatment when available has been shown to cut the recidivism rate for sex offenders by almost 50 per cent.

• (1615)

For these reasons the people in the opposition party recommend that first the programs be established to rehabilitate convicted sex offenders to reduce their chances of re-offending once they are released, all the while supporting tough sentences. Second, a national registry of convicted child abusers be established. This information will be made available to organizations employing people who work or volunteer with children. Three, serious sex offenders who are not cured by the

end of their sentences be transferred to a secure mental health facility.

After conviction but prior to sentencing the prosecutor could request that the offender's eventual release be subject to a review under provincial health laws. After serving the sentence the inmate would then be brought back to court where it would be determined if he or she is rehabilitated to return to the community. If not the person would be made a ward of the health care system until it is safe to release that person.

We believe that these amendments shore up the balance between the rights of victims and the rights of the convicted.

In closing I would like to mention a case of a young woman 15 years of age who was being harassed by telephone calls at her place of employment where she worked every evening between the hours of 6 and 10. Someone was phoning her every night, phone call after phone call. This person was only 15 years of age and was absolutely terrified. She approached me and we had the police department set up a phone tap at her place of business. The police were able to trace the call. They went to the home. The person did not deny he was making the phone calls. He was told he was to cease and desist.

A couple of months passed and the phone calls started again. The same person, even though the police knew who he was and the police had told him that he had to cease and desist, repeated those harassment calls over a matter of a couple of months.

This bill will stop that kind of nonsense and relieve that young person of the fear she had. Her parents had to come and pick her up at night to take her home from work because she was afraid to walk home alone.

I am pleased with Bill C-126. Hopefully it will be followed up with educational programs to change the attitudes within society. The mindset that has allowed family violence including stalking to flourish for so long must be abolished from Canadian society. It is only at that time women will be able to live in a fair and safe and a just society.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion.

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.

* * *

LAND TITLES REPEAL ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-103, an act to provide for the repeal of the Land Titles Act and to amend other acts in relation thereto, as reported (with amendment) from a legislative committee.

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): There are 10 motions in amendment standing on the Notice Paper for the report stage of Bill C-103, an act to provide for the repeal of the Land Titles Act and to amend other acts in relation thereto, all in the name of the hon. member for Nunatsiaq.

[*Translation*]

Motions Nos. 1 to 10 will be grouped for debate, with the vote on motion No. 1 applying to the other motions.

[*English*]

I shall now proceed with the putting of Motions Nos. 1 through 10 to the House.

• (1620)

Is there consent to have another member move the motions for the hon. member for Nunatsiaq? Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I am sorry we cannot proceed.

Hon. Shirley Martin (for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development) moved that the bill be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Madam Deputy Speaker: When shall the bill be read the third time? By leave, now?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mrs. Martin (for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development) moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.

An hon. member: Mr. Speaker, I wished to speak on third reading.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I am sorry, I have already put it through, but I will revert with agreement of the House. Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): There is not consent.

* * *

CANADA PETROLEUM RESOURCES ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-106, an act to amend certain petroleum related acts in respect of Canadian ownership requirements and to confirm the validity of a certain regulation, as reported (without amendment) from a legislative committee.

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): There are two motions in amendment standing in the name of the hon. member for Edmonton East on the Notice Paper for the report stage of Bill C-106, an act to amend certain petroleum-related acts in respect of Canadian ownership requirements and to confirm the validity of a certain regulation.

Both motions go beyond the scope of the bill. They are introducing new concepts not contemplated in the bill as approved in principle at second reading. Therefore according to citation 698(1) of Beauchesne's sixth edition, these motions are out of order and will not be selected by the Chair.

There being no further amendments, I shall now propose to the House the motion for the concurrence of the bill at report stage.

MEASURE TO AMEND

Hon. Shirley Martin (for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources) moved that the bill be concurred in.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Harvey (Edmonton East): On division.

Motion agreed to.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): When shall the bill be read the third time? By leave, now?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mrs. Martin (for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources) moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Ross Harvey (Edmonton East): Mr. Speaker, I am indeed sorry that the amendments I proposed at report stage on this bill were deemed to be out of order because I think considering each in turn would have helped to focus the mind of the House on the actual import and impact of Bill C-106. The House having been denied that opportunity, I will see what I can do to rectify it at this third reading.

• (1625)

To start I would like to quote at length from the North American free trade agreement. I refer your attention to article 1102 in chapter eleven of the North American free trade agreement titled national treatment. It reads in section 1:

> Each Party shall accord to investors of another Party treatment no less favourable than it accords, in like circumstances, to its own investors with respect to the establishment, acquisition, expansion, management, conduct, operation, and sale or other disposition of investments.

Section 4 of article 1102 reads:

> For greater certainty, no Party may
>
> (a) impose on an investor of another party a requirement that a minimum level of equity in an enterprise in the territory of the Party be held by its nationals, other than nominal qualifying shares for directors or incorporators of corporations;

This means that the Canadian ownership rule we have had in place since 1982, which has served by virtue of the previous government policy for Canada outside the lands administered under federal jurisdiction, and the act that we are repealing here today for those areas within federal jurisdiction, which is the Canada lands in the north and the offshore areas off Newfoundland and Nova Scotia, has been a requirement since 1982 that any

person receiving a production licence for oil or gas would have to be a Canadian citizen, a permanent resident or a corporation the shares of which are 50 per cent held by Canadians.

We should be very clear on this. What the bill before us this afternoon proposes to do is delete that Canadian ownership requirement. It means that henceforth in the areas where previously you had to have 50 per cent Canadian ownership at least to undertake production of oil and gas you will now have no minimum Canadian ownership requirement.

You could be 100 per cent Fijian or Mercurian and it would not matter. You could still go ahead. The other restrictions of course would apply but the Canadian ownership requirement would not. This brings our statute and regulations into full accord with the North American free trade agreement in articles 1102 and sections 1 and 4.

There is as well in this North American free trade agreement article 1108, reservations and exceptions. I should like now to turn to that. It reads:

> Articles 1102, 1103, 1106 and 1107 do not apply to:
>
> (a) any existing non-conforming measure that is maintained by
>
> (i) a Party at the federal level as set out in its Schedule to Annex I or III

Even though we have maintained in statute and policy what we can call in the language of the North American free trade agreement a non-conforming measure we can do that now only if we set out in Canada's schedule to annex I basically a statement that we are maintaining this non-conforming measure.

Lo and behold that is precisely what the government did. You will find it on page I-C-23 of the North American free trade agreement. It reads in part on this annex page which deals with the sector on energy and the subsection of oil and gas:

> Industry classification: SIC O71 Crude Petroleum and Natural Gas Industries
>
> Type of Reservation: National Treatment (Article 1102)
>
> Level of Government: Federal

Among the measures included in the reservation are those arising out of the Canada Petroleum Resources Act, the Territorial Lands Act, the Public Lands Grants Act, the Canada-Newfoundland Atlantic Accord Implementation Act, the Canada-Nova Scotia Offshore Petroleum Resources Accord Implementation Act and the Canada Oil and Gas Land Regulations.

• (1630)

The description of the reservation governing investment includes:

> Persons who hold oil and gas production licenses or shares therein for discoveries made after March 5, 1982 must be Canadian citizens ordinarily resident in Canada, permanent residents or corporations incorporated in Canada. No production license may be issued for discoveries made after March 5, 1982 unless the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources is satisfied that the Canadian ownership rate of the interest-owner in relation to the production license on the date of issuance would not be less than 50 per cent.

That is the golden umbrella beneath which we sheltered our Canadian ownership requirement from the North American free trade agreement. However there is a catch. I will read article 1108 again: "Articles 1102, 1103, 1106 and 1107 do not apply to a) any existing non-conforming measure that is maintained".

"Any existing non-conforming measure". With the anticipated passage of Bill C-106 we are removing, deleting, and eradicating our existing non-conforming measure. This having been done, we will not hereafter, for so long as the North American free trade agreement is in effect, be allowed to return to a regime of Canadian ownership requirements.

What we are proposing to do today is delete in perpetuity the ability of the Canadian people through their Parliament to determine that some minimum percentage of the strategic petroleum industry must be undertaken and maintained by Canadian nationals. Henceforth, that ability of the Canadian people to determine this element in their economic fate will be gone. That is the import of Bill C-106.

Some people will say that is okay, it does not matter, who cares? They will say that we are getting globalized, capital is moving back and forth and borders are meaningless. Unfortunately that thesis is simply incorrect and the experience of Canada in this regard is decisively instructive.

For better than a decade now the Petroleum Monitoring Agency has been keeping records about the inflow and outflow of capital into and out of Canada within the petroleum industry. It has been keeping these records in a series of different accounts. The record is abundantly clear.

An hon. member: Abundantly clear?

Mr. Harvey (Edmonton East): It is abundantly clear. It is inescapably clear. It could not be clearer if it came up to him with a sledge-hammer and beaned him.

What it shows is that for the period from 1980 to 1990—and this is not a particularly odd decade in these regards; we could choose any other decade and find the same thing—while Canadian controlled companies in the petroleum industry generated a net inflow of $1.5 billion into Canada foreign controlled companies in the Canadian petroleum industry generated a net outflow of $25.3 billion.

That can only be described as a terrible drain on the Canadian economy. It unquestionably cost us millions of jobs. It unquestionably dampened whatever economic activity we might otherwise have obtained and it unquestionably continues to harm our economy. That is the price of foreign control in the petroleum industry. It is clear and it is plain. It should come as a surprise to no one.

In Bill C-106 we are proposing to replicate on the Canada lands precisely those conditions which led to this grotesque outflow of capital from Canada in consequence of foreign control and ownership from the western sedimentary basin in the decade of the 1980s.

These facts are so plain, so clear and so compelling that one stands in amazement, grasping for some reason that any government with the Canadian national interest in mind would propose such an absurd bill.

• (1635)

I must say, short of what borders on conspiracy theory on the one hand or actions of rank stupidity on the other, I find it difficult to come up with a reasonable explanation. The explanation that has been fronted by the industry touts—for example the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers which masquerades as a Canadian association but which is principally, not exclusively, a front for the American controlled companies that operate in Canada—submitted a letter to the committee that allegedly studied the bill which said: "Capital migrates to countries where the opportunities offer attractive terms and demonstrate competitive yields. The Canadian ownership restrictions discourage needed capital inflows". Is that not ironic?

It continued: "The Canadian ownership restrictions discourage needed capital inflows by suggesting to foreign investors that their capital is neither needed nor welcome. This is a negative signal, the end result of which is that opportunities for Canadian companies are undermined since they are reliant on capital inflow for development".

Clearly this is a captious argument and it is so precisely because it is saying this legislation will have benefit for Canadian companies when the whole point is to allow the greater activity in the Canada lands of non-Canadian companies. Without wishing to sound too derisive I think we can safely say that the argument advanced by the CAPP and others in this regard is at best self-serving.

This brings me to the final mystery I wish to contemplate this afternoon. Why in the name of sweet reason does the Official Opposition find itself supporting this bill? On a recorded division at second reading, every Liberal present in the House rose in support of this bill. I suspect if we were to undertake a recorded division at third reading we would find the same thing. This is a mystery to me.

Over the years I have disagreed with the Liberal Party of Canada on many things but I always thought that at least it was a quasi-nationalist party. It amazes me that a quasi-nationalist party could bring itself to support this odious little piece of comprador selling out. I do not understand it.

I rather look forward to any of the Liberal members here this afternoon getting up to say how the party of Pearson, Trudeau, St. Laurent, Mackenzie King or any of the reasonable Liberal Prime Ministers we have experienced in this nation's history can support this unfortunate, costly, shameful, and comprador piece of legislation. I look forward to it but I do not anticipate it.

I have no doubt that this bill will pass. The government's majority will ensure that. However no argument has been adduced at second reading, in committee or thus far this afternoon which can possibly support the passage of this bill in the face of the certain negative consequences.

In summary, what is proposed this afternoon is that we strip from the Canadian people forever, or least for as long as the North American free trade agreement remains in effect, their ability to reserve petroleum development in the Canada lands for Canadians by Canadians and in the Canadian interest. We are stripping that away and we do so knowing full well that over the long term the principal consequence of that will be the massive export of needed capital from our country.

I would welcome anyone rising in this House this afternoon to make a compelling and logical argument as to why in the face of these certainties this House should support this bill. In fact I defy any member present to attempt it.

Mr. Fred J. Mifflin (Bonavista—Trinity—Conception): Mr. Speaker, I was interested to hear my friend from Edmonton East.

• (1640)

I want to talk to this bill on third reading because I think it is a very important bill. It is a bill that perhaps does need a fair amount of examination, but we have been through that. Examination has been done and we are at the final stages of this Parliament and I find it very interesting that some of the old arguments have started all over again.

As I understand this bill its purpose is to relax the foreign investment rules on March 25, 1992, which essentially were meant in respect to all. It was meant not only to apply to the conventional areas but also to the frontier lands, those north of 60 degrees, and the offshore which is controlled by the federal government.

It was very clear that my friend was not in favour of the relaxation of the foreign investment rules. For this reason he was very much against Bill C–106 on the grounds that it was essentially a sell–out. I am not sure if he used the term but he indicated that he was concerned about the energy sell–out.

That is one point of view but there are a number of things we had to consider in the third reading of this bill. To begin with I think there may be general agreement that the federal government in the last few years has done very little to assist the Canadian oil and gas sector during this period of great difficulty for it, one of our major resources. It is in difficulty essentially because of low profitability.

In the general sense the idea is that the relaxation of the foreign investment rules would likely do very little to address the economic problems but by the same token, and I do appreciate what the hon. member had to say, we are caught in a crossfire between trying to do something to develop the resource and at the same time trying to restrict foreign investment and the present rules on foreign investment with respect to the oil industry as they exist. It is a very delicate balance. We tend to come down on the other side of the balance than do the NDP. In the moments ahead I may be able to explain why.

I should also point out that it is my understanding that Bill C–106 will also have the effect of amending the following legislation: the Canadian Petroleum Resources Act, the Canada–Nova Scotia Offshore Petroleum Resources Accord Implementation Act, and the Canada–Newfoundland Atlantic Accord Implementation Act.

I took a personal interest in this because of the existence of the megaproject, Hibernia, smack in the centre of my riding. In the case of Hibernia it was exempt from the foreign investment ownership rule because it was discovered before 1982 and the 50 per cent Canadian requirement did not really apply. However foreign investment restrictions apply to the other oil fields in the Grand Banks of Newfoundland. This is significant because more than 50 per cent of the reserves in the Terra Nova field are for sale and an open investment policy may speed up its sale. That is one concern there.

As I said earlier, the oil and gas sector in Canada is in great difficulty. I am sure the hon. member who just spoke knows this, and in fact anybody from western Canada involved in the energy and oil natural resources sector would be aware of it. It is in a financial crisis with poor profit prospects.

I have sat in on some of the committee meetings and these poor prospects are not only for now and next year in line with the economic slump we are in. The projections are that it will be in difficulty for the next couple of years. I hope this situation will not last until the turn of the century but certainly the indication from all the oil economists is that the energy industry and the oil and gas sector will be in difficulty until at least 1995. Mass

lay-offs are still anticipated in the upstream and downstream sectors.

As an individual I have a great affinity and a great feel for a major industry that involves lay-offs and for any remedial measures that may be considered in order to alleviate the situation.

• (1645)

If I could be permitted to give a comparison it perhaps would help the hon. member see the motivation behind at least where I am coming from and I am sure the party. In Newfoundland we have the northern cod moratorium. Fishing is a major industry for that region of Canada. The northern cod stocks have all but disappeared from Newfoundland. Essentially 22,000 people have been laid off. They are on a cod moratorium. That could be called, in anybody's definition and particularly in a country with a labour force as low as 13 million people, 22,000 in a province with roughly 300,000 workers, a massive lay-off.

I would also say parenthetically that in response to the moratorium, which is only a piecemeal measure and should be expected from a government that essentially has mismanaged the fishery, the compensation will go on for as long as the moratorium exists as far as I am concerned and as far as my party is concerned.

In this case the government has two parallel actions which are going in different directions. While the government is paying compensation to 22,000 northern cod workers and other thousands with the most recent package on the one hand, on the other hand we have 103 foreign vessels off the Grand Banks of Newfoundland illegally fishing and the government will not do anything to stop them.

The government is saying: "It is too bad about the fishery. We are going to compensate you, but by the same token we are going to let foreigners catch fish illegally. However if you catch fish in Newfoundland, in your own waters, we will make sure that you go to court, your boat and belongings are seized and that you will be prosecuted and probably sent to jail". In that case we have two policies going in the opposite direction from the same government.

In this case it would seem the government does realize that because of the potential of massive lay-offs on the west coast of Canada and on the prairies in the Calgary area and in the oil field area of Canada, there should be a more parallel action on the part of the government. This bill is the impetus behind it.

It is possible, in relation to the oil and gas industry, that opening it up to foreign investment would mean an important source of technology, knowledge, and more important, investment capital. As I say, it is a balance and we have to draw the line somewhere.

It was interesting that we were criticized by the present government for allowing foreign investment and for looking at foreign investment in a certain way. Now the government is opening up the doors a little bit to foreign investment in order to help an industry that is in difficulty. In this particular case I personally have no difficulty with that.

The line is drawn, irrespective of the policies of the predecessors or the leaders and Prime Ministers of my party in the last 100 years. Times are changing and we have to look at the circumstances as they are now and apply remedial and legislative action to ensure that we get the best bang for the buck in the industries that we have. If that involves some measures with respect to foreign investment and legislation then so be it. We have to go along with that.

The oil and gas industry in the last few years is giving a return of 4 per cent to 5 per cent. That is not a very attractive rate. I want to quantify the difficulty it is in. That does not even keep up essentially with the interest rates that are paid on blue chip investment. There is no question about it, we have some great difficulty here.

The total oil and gas revenue and cash flow was reduced by $130 million for every 1 per cent increase in the exchange rate. On top of the low productivity and the low return, we are being very adversely affected by the change in the exchange rate. Given that the industry reinvests a large portion of its cash flow into new exploration and development, the high Canadian dollar until recent reductions had been at least partly responsible for the low rate of exploration and development in Canada. Investment capital is desperately needed in the industry and one way to get it would be precisely through what this bill is doing, relaxing the foreign ownership rules. However, it is recognized by all that this would be a short-term benefit. The industry would have to live or die on its own, depending on what happens after the combination of the economic downturn which has not

really turned around yet despite what the government may suggest in the various budgets, and the increased, we hope, impetus due to this legislation which hopefully will be passed today.

• (1650)

It is in the nation's best interest to take this step. Clearly I would because I would not be here speaking about it otherwise. What implication would selling a stake in the industry have?

An hon. member: Capital exports.

Mr. Mifflin: Capital exports or some people may say exploitation or sellout. Frankly I do not see the weight on that side of the issue.

If I could summarize, we in the Liberal Party are sympathetic to the need for new capital in the oil industry. I believe it is needed.

I would do no less if it were required in the fisheries industry to alleviate the massive lay-off in Newfoundland and Atlantic Canada. It would be hypocritical of me to stand up and not to speak in favour of this bill because essentially all we are doing is applying the same principle which unfortunately cannot be applied in this total sense to the fishery industry.

I would like to see the government take functional jurisdiction over the nose and tail of the bank. That is what I would consider to be equivalent to the measures that are being proposed by this bill.

The bill is essentially saying that yes, there are risks in taking this action. But we are taking the risk to reduce the restrictions on foreign investment in this industry because we feel that on balance it will help the industry.

In the case of the fishery industry, the same risk pertains. If we announce functional jurisdiction over the nose and tail of the bank beyond the 200-mile limit, we may have some difficulty in trading with Spain and Portugal, which is in the vicinity of about $175 million. It may affect other industries and we may have difficulties with maritime law at the international law courts in Geneva. We have had two emergency debates in this House on the subject and my colleagues and I believe that the risk is worth the gain.

I want the government to take note that the Liberal Party is prepared to take the risk in the case of the part of the world that relies on the oil and gas industry. I would counsel them to take the same kind of risk in the few days remaining in this Parliament for the fishery in Newfoundland with respect to functional jurisdiction over the nose and tail of the Grand Banks and to stop foreign fishermen from taking the resources that Newfoundlanders are not allowed to use themselves right now.

In summary, I believe that given the circumstances and the need for the oil and gas industry to get out of the slump it is in, we support this bill. I look forward to any other comments that people may have with respect to the risk and the balance.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Before I recognize the hon. member, I have received written notice from the hon. member for Okanagan—Shuswap that he is unable to move his motion during private members' hour on Monday, June 14, 1993.

It has not been possible to arrange an exchange of positions in the order of precedence pursuant to Standing Order 94(2)(a). Accordingly, I am directing the table officers to drop the item of business to the bottom of the order of precedence. Private members' hour will thus be cancelled and pursuant to Standing Order 99(2) the House will meet to consider Government Orders at 11 o'clock a.m.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Champagne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and Minister of Forestry): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few minutes of the time of the House to speak in support of Bill C-106, which in my opinion is an extremely important piece of legislation. It is, in fact, an economic development tool for the Canadian petroleum industry.

I also want to allay the fears raised by my NDP colleague that this legislation will cause an outflow of capital to other countries and that Canadians will no longer be free to develop their own oil industry as they see fit.

What the bill says is quite straightforward: The 50 per cent Canadian ownership requirement will no longer apply. But on the other hand, the bill says that only a corporation incorporated in Canada may hold a production licence or share in a production licence.

• (1655)

If a corporation is incorporated in Canada, it is subject to our laws. As my Liberal colleague pointed out, this bill will make it possible for foreign capital to be invested in this country and will promote the transfer of advanced technologies that are found throughout the world. It will help Canadian workers and Canadian industry compete on domestic and international markets. It will help attract investment that will be able to spend more on various programs.

I will be brief, however, because I know my Liberal colleagues support the bill. Incidentally, my NDP colleague wondered why the Liberals were in favour of this bill. The answer is quite simple. It is a sensible piece of legislation that respects the industry as well Canadian sovereignty and identity. Therefore the petroleum industry can look forward to a more prosperous future.

[*English*]

Mr. Ross Harvey (Edmonton East): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his remarks. As did the hon. member from Newfoundland, the hon. member who just spoke mentioned among other things that this bill would make it possible—please do not leave—

Mr. Champagne: I am staying. I am not from Newfoundland.

Mr. Harvey (Edmonton East): I mentioned him in addition to the hon. member. The bill will make it possible that there be technology transfers to Canada presumably from other places on the planet where foreign corporations have developed technology that we can use here and thus better exploit our resources.

I suspect the hon. member who has just spoken and who is the parliamentary secretary is aware of the fact that Canada currently enjoys an overwhelming positive trade balance in oilfield technology. In fact, we are among the technological leaders on the planet. In those areas that would be affected by the bill, which is to say the Canada lands and the offshore, we have the leading technology in the world today. They are Canadian technologies.

I am not quite certain what technologies the parliamentary secretary and the member from Newfoundland were speaking of when they said that this bill might facilitate a greater infusion of technology. We have it. It is here. It is ours. We make our money selling it internationally.

The question I want to put to the hon. member is whether, in his opinion, there is any correlation between the introduction of this bill and its support by the government party and the Official Opposition and the fact that both received very generous donations from the foreign controlled oil companies. The donation that springs to mind immediately was in 1991 when I believe $49,000 was given to each of them by Imperial Oil. As well thousands and thousands of dollars come to each of them from virtually all the foreign controlled petroleum companies operating in Canada. I would like to know whether he sees any correlation.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Champagne: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member sees problems where there are none. What I want to say is this: If we have a large share of the technology and if we want to keep developing that technology, we need capital.

I don't think any sensible Canadian would close the door on investment that would create jobs for Canadians from all provinces and promote further development of Canadian technology, because we want to invest in research and development. That is exactly what the bill says. Let's forget Canadian ownership but keep statutory control over the corporation incorporated under Canadian law. That is what the bill does. It opens the door to investment in order to expand the horizons of the Canadian energy sector and the industry as such. This legislation is important to maintain investment in the industry and to develop our technology.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

• (1700)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

Some hon. members: On division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion the yeas have it. I declare the motion carried on division.

Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURE TO AMEND

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West) moved that Bill C–417, an act to amend the Criminal Code (gun control), be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee in the Departmental envelope.

He said: Mr. Speaker, thank you and the members who are here this afternoon when we do not have to be here on a Friday. There are so many who are in support of this bill.

This is one of those bills that began with a telephone call about three months ago from someone who is a gun collector who informed me that due to a legal interpretation of an old law the situation had changed rather dramatically.

For many years under the existing law, people who purchased a restricted weapon would bring it to a fire arms registrar for examination and they would be given a temporary conveyance permit to take it home. That had gone on for years. All of a sudden there was an interpretation that the fire arms registrar could not give them the weapon to take back home. On the surface that may not seem like a problem but it is a problem and creates a somewhat unsafe situation.

This House spent many hours over a couple of years dealing with changes to the Criminal Code to make the gun situation in this country safer. We said in clear unequivocal terms that anyone who wished to possess a restricted weapon must provide safe storage for that weapon as part of the conditions of a permit. There could be examination of that safe storage and so on.

All of a sudden we have a change in legal interpretation that keeps those guns away from that safe storage. It has taken up to six months for permanent registration certificates to be issued. This puts responsibility on the part of the fire arms registrar in many situations in this country and in particular in rural situations where there is just not adequate storage available for the quantity of weapons that begin to pile up.

What I propose today is something I asked the House of Commons legal branch to draft that would give a permissive power to a fire arms registrar to allow someone to take that fire arm back to the safe storage when he or she already have a permit to own a restricted weapon which means they have safe storage.

It would not apply to people purchasing a weapon of this kind for the first time and it is not compulsory for the fire arms registrar tell someone to take it home. It is permissive and a person can fill out a form that would allow that gun to move from the fire arms registrar office to the owner's place when there is safe storage for the weapon.

I do not think it is worth the time of the House to have three hours of debate and a votable motion at the end of that time. I think the committee in its wisdom decided that this is not one of the items that should come to a vote.

It leaves the House in the position of deciding unanimously to make this change which we could do today through all stages and if the House was predisposed to do that. I have copies of some minor changes which have been recommended to me by the Department of Justice that would make the bill work just a little bit better as an amendment to the Criminal Code. Those are prepared. I have them in sufficient quantity for everybody in the House. If anyone would like them I would ask a page to come and make them available to them. There is no point in going through those changes unless we find out the will of the House. I think it might be in order to allow members who wish to speak to this to do so. Perhaps they could indicate whether they think it is a good idea for the House act. If we were to move it through all stages this afternoon, it could go to the Senate the first part of next week and pass through there relatively quickly as well. It is an administrative change that I think makes sense for everybody.

• (1705)

It simply wants to enable restricted weapons to be stored in a safer situation than the law allows currently and that was the will of the House historically and overwhelmingly so. This would just extend that principle.

I invite my colleagues to make comments and indicate whether there is a predisposition on the part of the House to do this unanimously and put it in place as quickly as possible to take that danger away. I thank the House for its attention.

Mr. Robert D. Nault (Kenora—Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honour to speak. I do not speak very often on private member's bills because so many go through the House that will never see the light of day.

This is a very good piece of legislation that my colleague from Calgary West has put forward because it is just straight common sense. I want to lay out the concerns that gun owners have with the present situation as it exists and the suggestion in Bill C–417 that my colleague from Calgary West has put forward.

In the last few days in my riding of Kenora—Rainy River I called the different police stations in such communities as Kenora, Dryden and Sioux Lookout to verify whether my colleague from Calgary West was correct. I asked them what kind of difficulties they were having with the permits that go to individuals who want to register their restricted firearms.

One of the problems they are having is that those firearms have to be stored somewhere until the owner receives a permit from the provincial registrar. That may not seem to be a major concern to those who are not too familiar with firearms, but when we have major gun clubs in communities like Kenora, Dryden and Sioux Lookout, literally hundreds and in some cases thousands of firearms can change hands on a yearly basis. In rural Canada these small detachments have only limited space for storage. We have created an administrative nightmare for no reason.

My colleague is asking us to just use good common sense in this particular private member's bill. We should allow those individuals who already own registered firearms to take their newly acquired firearms home and store them in their own approved storage facilities to make sure a very valuable piece of equipment is looked after until the permit is received.

This private member's bill wants to allow individuals, who have already been searched by the police department and checked out thoroughly, who have proven to be conscientious gun owners in the past and know and have passed certain tests relating to the handling of firearms, to meet the requirements under this private member's bill.

One of the biggest concerns of gun owners and police officers who have to store these firearms is that they can be worth from $500 to $3,000. The police department has had to wait up to six weeks in the last year and in previous years anywhere from three months to six months for permits. That particular firearm was under severe threat of losing its value because of the fact that it could get rust on it and it was not maintained simply because the police department is not set up to do those kinds of things.

• (1710)

In conclusion I want to say that this will not only save money for gun owners and for police departments that will not have to administer a particular piece of the act that is not necessary, but it will also streamline the system for all those concerned. It retains the safety and integrity of the system that we now know and want to keep in place but at the same time it is a smart piece of legislation just because of its practicality.

I would like to concur with my colleague the member for Calgary West that we attempt to go through all stages tonight and pass it here in this place and send it to the Senate simply because to delay this and send it to committee would not serve any purpose because of the obvious result of this piece of legislation.

I want to thank my colleague for putting forward a very intelligent piece of legislation. I urge the members of the House here today to consider giving unanimous consent to pass it at all stages.

Mr. Ken Hughes (Macleod): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to speak to Bill C–417 put forward by the hon. member for Calgary West.

This is simply a very practical proposition and response to representations that a number of us in the House have received. I am really delighted and I encourage members

on all sides of the House to support this and to allow us to proceed with this as expeditiously as possible.

There are many members in the House today who have worked hard on this issue and on the pre-study. The hon. members for Cariboo—Chilcotin, Kenora—Rainy River and our colleague here from Cape Breton also worked on this. We have heard from many people involved in the firearms community. We have heard those representations and I certainly endorse this very important practical bill, C-417.

Mr. Dave Worthy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a couple of things on this bill because I believe it is a very practical bill. I do not think it requires a lot of debate.

I just want to assure any of those who are watching that over the two years, as has been mentioned, when the new legislation was fashioned we were not all happy necessarily with the balance that was created. However we recognize why that balance ended up where it was.

I just wanted to assure my colleagues and those who are interested in this issue that I do not see that this change does anything to disrupt that balance. It is in fact correcting a situation that we had not foreseen and it just makes the system not only more efficient but in fact safer.

One of the reasons why it makes it safer is that many of the firearms officers who are RCMP officers are not equipped to handle the storage of these guns. In terms of safety of storage it is in fact the person who already has at least one registered gun who probably has safer storage to provide than that of local police shop.

In rural situations my constituents find in many cases that the restricted weapon that they are trying to acquire may be in Vancouver. It requires in some cases a return trip some six, seven or eight months later to pick up the weapon. It is just not practical and it is inconveniencing legitimate gun owners.

I also would encourage members of the House to expedite movement of this bill through all stages today.

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I see no one else rising and I wonder if now might be the appropriate time to put the question as to whether or not we have unanimous consent to deal with this bill at all stages.

If the answer to that question is yes then I think there would have to be a series of subsequent steps and I would like to be recognized again on another point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Members have heard the hon. member. Is there unanimous consent to allow the motion to go through at all stages?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): There is not unanimous consent.

There being no further members rising for debates, the time provided for consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired.

Pursuant to Standing Order 96(1) the order is dropped from the Order Paper. Pursuant to Standing Order 38(5), the motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it the wish of the House to suspend the sitting to the call of the bell?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The sitting of the House was suspended at 5.18 p.m.

SITTING RESUMED

The House resumed at 5.31 p.m.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Further to the announcement the Chair made concerning Private Members' Business I wish to state there is now the possibility of an exchange. Consequently on Monday at 11 a.m. Motion No. 677 will be taken up.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

AIR INDIA

Hon. Alan Redway (Don Valley East): Mr. Speaker, do you remember where you were on the morning of June 23, 1985? That was almost eight years ago now.

Dr. Bal K. Gupta remembers. Dr. H. S. Radhakrishna remembers. The Aurora family remembers. The Jain family remembers. The Khan family, the Patel family, the Sharma family, the Singh family, the Uppal family, the Castonguay family and many others remember.

They remember, Mr. Speaker, and you may remember as well because that was the morning that we and they received the shocking and the horrifying news that many members of their families had perished on Air India flight 182. That was a flight bound from Toronto via Montreal to London and New Delhi. It plunged into the ocean off the coast of Ireland killing some 329 innocent men, women and children. Two hundred and seventy-nine of those people were Canadian citizens and they came from every corner of this country and every province from Newfoundland to British Columbia.

The very same day a bomb went off in connection with another Air India flight originating in Canada. That bomb went off at Tokyo's Narita International Airport and killed two Japanese citizens and injured four others.

Long ago an investigation was conducted and completed in Ireland in connection with the Air India flight 182. Long ago an investigation was conducted and completed in India but an investigation of this tragedy has been under way now in Canada for almost eight years. It is still going on and there have never been charges laid or convictions registered in connection with this.

There have been allegations that there were warnings made in connection with this flight that were ignored. There have been allegations that evidence has been destroyed. Last year the RCMP raised wreckage from the floor of the ocean off Ireland but on June 1 of this year the Solicitor General told the House that the investigation continues to be active and ongoing, eight years later.

Is it any wonder that the families and friends of those 279 Canadians who perished are frustrated, angry and bitter?

Surely it is time that either charges are laid or if that is not possible we institute a judicial inquiry immediately.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Champagne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and Minister of Forestry): Mr. Speaker, a terrible tragedy took place on June 23, eight years ago, when Air India flight 182 crashed in the Irish sea, killing 329 passengers.

• (1735)

On the premise that the explosion was caused by a bomb placed in the aircraft by terrorists, Canada embarked on the most extensive and costliest criminal investigation in its history.

Three times, under difficult conditions, the RCMP initiated operations at sea in an attempt to recover evidence. This particular incident and other acts of terrorism in Canada and abroad have caused the government to undertake a thorough review of our national security and anti-terrorist system, including anti-terrorist measures in the civil aviation sector.

As hon. members are probably aware, when he appeared before the Standing Committee on Justice and Sollicitor General on April 29, 1993, the Commissioner of the RCMP gave the assurance that the investigation was ongoing. The government feels it is extremely important the the perpetrators of this crime be brought to justice. The government makes no apology for spending whatever money is necessary to find the perpetrators of this heinous crime.

The government sees no purpose in holding a public inquiry, however, because this exercise, in dealing with the circumstances of the tragedy, might prejudice the progress of the current police investigation and jeopardize court cases.

The government has certainly not forgotten the innocent families that have been through so much and wants to give them the assurance that it is doing everything to ensure that justice is done.

Adjournment Debate

[*English*]

ARMED FORCES

Mr. Fred J. Mifflin (Bonavista—Trinity—Conception): Mr. Speaker, I rise to follow up on a question I asked the Minister of National Defence on April 2.

The question and subsequent events cause me to want to follow this up more than I have on any other occasion on the late show.

The question was to the Minister of Defence which in her absence was answered by the House leader of the government. It was: Why did it take from the March 16 to the end of March, a period of two and a half weeks for information about a major incident that happened in Somalia, namely the death of a Somalian at the hands of peacekeepers, to reach the Canadian public? Why was it made known the way it was: essentially accidentally from a member of the media? And more precisely, why did the Minister of National Defence not inform this House or at least the Canadian public what had happened?

The House leader's response to me was that everything happened the way it should have happened. It was done the way it was done because investigations were going on and attributed the motivation for my question to the fact that the Minister of National Defence was running for the Conservative leadership. Normally I might have had a point of privilege on that, but because of the gravity of the events I did not want to get involved in any action of that nature. I avoided mixing up the issues with an issue of personal privilege.

You may recall that after April 2 we had an Easter break and we came back to the House again. On April 19, two weeks later, I then asked the Minister of National Defence who was in the House, the same question as to why she did not tell the public of the event in Somalia the day after or within a reasonable period of time after it happened. The minister got up and said to me that it was all the mistake of national defence. It was an incredible thing. She said it was a regrettable mistake and that national defence had the information but instead of releasing the information in Canada it released it in theatre.

That just does not wash because to begin with there were members of the media in Belet Huen where this incident occurred. A press release was issued but it was issued in Mogadishu, 260 kilometres away. There were members of the media there when it happened and not only were they not told about it, they were diverted from any knowledge of the incident.

I followed up the question the next day on April 20 and asked the Minister of National Defence, answered by the government House leader, why the minister did not tell the House. The answer I got was very much obfuscatory and very confusing.

• (1740)

Subsequent events have shown that this incident occurred on March 16. The Minister of National Defence was briefed on March 17. A member involved in this was incarcerated on March 18 and the minister subsequently said that she did not know anything had involved murder or homicide until March 31.

To begin with, if the minister was briefed on this she would have been briefed on the total issue. She would have known that the Canadian media did not carry the stories the next day. Therefore I find it absolutely preposterous that the minister would not cause—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I regret the hon. member's time has expired.

Mr. Bill Domm (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for Science and Minister of State (Small Businesses and Tourism)): Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of uninformed comment on recent events.

It contrasts with the remarkable praise Canadian forces personnel have received elsewhere. They have received praise from a Canadian surgeon working with an American NGO who wants people to know that Canadian troops really did a good job and praise from Somalis who said that Canadians had shown them respect and did not want them to leave.

Yes, there have also been disturbing events. They are being dealt with so let us review what we know of these events and make up our own minds. Each of the four Somali events has been or is being investigated.

In each case the Canadian forces gave public notice of the incident. The details are on public record and were summarized in the minister's statement in the House on April 26, 1993.

I would also like to comment on the board of inquiry of the Canadian Airborne Regiment Battle Group which was convened by the chief of defence staff at the minister's request.

As the Minister of National Defence has said, she was confronted by the dual imperative of her responsibility for the management and direction of the Canadian forces on the one hand and on the other her quasi-judicial responsibilities in the military system of justice.

In those roles she has balanced the need to inform the public and Parliament with the need to ensure that the military justice system is not prejudiced. Mindful of her responsibility she sought advice on how best to address a variety of concerns and directed the chief of the defence staff to convene a board of inquiry.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Ms. Mary Clancy (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, on March 17 of this year I asked the Prime Minister why the current policies prohibiting sexual harassment in the military were not working.

The Minister of National Defence, occupied elsewhere today, replied by stating that a report was issued outlining the actual policy dealing with sexual harassment. While the minister maintained that the report emphasized the policy of zero tolerance for sexual harassment in the Canadian forces the report failed, abysmally I might add, to mention any means of effectively enforcing that policy.

Currently, many cases of sexual harassment are not reported for fear of retaliation. The victims of such abuse must have some form of recourse without fear of reprisal. However this report from the minister offers no such guarantees. It offers no encouragement to those who have suffered harassment to report such incidents.

Therefore the harassment continues as the perpetrators realize they will not be reported. This is not zero tolerance and it is not acceptable.

More than one-quarter of the women in the Canadian military say they have been sexually harassed over the past year. However only one in five women lodged a formal complaint. Those who did feared it hurt their careers.

In addition, it was revealed that there are serious problems in the way the military handles harassment complaints. Of those who complained 68.7 per cent were not happy with the results. It is very clear from the report released by the minister that the government has not addressed this issue sufficiently.

The victims of sexual harassment did not deserve to be further victimized. The people of Canada are worth more than that which the government has offered. They deserve protection from the offenders and peace of mind through the knowledge that reporting these matters will not result in further problems.

What does the minister propose to do to reconcile this matter and to protect these victims?

Mr. Bill Domm (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for Science and Minister of State (Small Businesses and Tourism)): Mr. Speaker, on March 17, 1993 the Minister of National Defence tabled Canadian forces harassment policy.

This formal policy, aligned with Treasury Board policy, has been in place since 1988. The policy is that harassment in any form, whether personal, sexual or abuse of power, is unacceptable conduct and will not be condoned in the Canadian forces in any way. Our ultimate goal is zero incidents, that is we hope to eliminate harassment entirely.

• (1745)

In follow-up to a commitment made on March 17, 1993 to make available further information regarding the CF and its harassment policy review, the Minister of National Defence tabled a package of documents in the House of Commons. The package tabled on May 5 included a report of the findings of a survey of 5,800 members administered confidentially regarding issues related to harassment policy and its implementation in the CF, and a more general report on the Canadian Forces approach to harassment in the work place.

We are launching an aggressive communication, education and training program to stop harassment before it starts. The CF proposes the creation of a CF harassment program co-ordination office at NDHQ to monitor and track any incidents of harassment, consult with harassment advisers and co-ordinate harassment, education and training programs and materials.

Further, the revisions in the plan are actively being pursued. These initiatives are strong evidence that the CF takes this issue very seriously and is providing leadership and guidance through concrete measures to improve its approach to personal harassment.

Adjournment Debate

EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, on March 22, I raised two questions in the House. I want to make sure I am not unfair here. I will read the first question. I want you to be the judge, Mr. Speaker, because I know you to be a fair member.

I said there were almost 50,000 unemployed men and women in Manitoba and that roughly one-quarter of them were young people aged 15 to 24. Manitoba has the country's highest and unfortunately fastest growing rate of child poverty. Manitobans are tired of this despair. They want action. I asked the government what specific measures it was prepared to take to get these people back to work.

To be fair, this is the answer I received from the hon. Minister of State for Finance and Privatization:

> Mr. Speaker, time would not allow me to list the number of endeavours this government has undertaken, but we could start with the $3.8 billion we are spending in training and retraining.

That is the point and he missed it. I asked what specific measures were being undertaken to address the question of poverty and the question of youth unemployment. He tells me how much the government is spending. I appreciate that. I knew that.

However, in spite of the fact that they are spending $3.8 billion, the question they have to ask is: Why is it that there are 1.6 million Canadians unemployed—some say it is twice that much because so many people have given up—2.2 million Canadians who will be fed in food banks this year, and 2.7 million Canadians receiving social assistance? I am told there are in fact 300,000 jobs available today but we do not have the trained people to fill them.

When they are spending that much money and they still has all these social problems, they ought to be doing something about it.

I want to quote my second question to make sure that I do not mislead anyone.

[*Translation*]

The minister tells us that his policies will deal with the situation. That is false. Why is there so much unemployment—25 per cent of young people in Manitoba—so much poverty in Manitoba—the highest poverty rate among young people in Canada and unfortunately the highest rate of poverty among the whole population? Why do so many people rely on food banks in Manitoba? What will the government do to put these people back to work?

[*English*]

This is what I receive as a response. The hon. Minister of State for Finance and Privatization says that I minimize the importance of training and retraining. He did not answer my question. Of course, Mr. Speaker, you know that is why I am here this evening.

The adjournment proceedings are precisely for this purpose. When we ask the minister a question and the minister does not answer the question adequately, appropriately and precisely, we have an opportunity to come here to seek redress, to try to get a specific answer.

[*Translation*]

That is what I want this evening, answers to my questions. What is the government prepared to do to put these young people back to work, to lower the poverty rate in Manitoba? Is it ready to act with specific policies? I do not want statistics. Statistics do not take care of people, do not take care of Manitobans and do not take care of other Canadians either.

[*English*]

All I want is this. Is the government prepared to do something specific for Manitobans? Yes or no. If it is yes, what is it prepared to do? That is it.

Mr. Bill Domm (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for Science and Minister of State (Small Businesses and Tourism)): Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to answer a question from the Official Opposition when it wants specifics. I wonder how specific it will be in its commitments in the upcoming election.

The government has always made training one of its highest priorities and is committed to helping every Canadian participate in and meet the skill requirements of the labour market both now and in the future.

I know that the Official Opposition does not like statistics but I think if we are going to answer for what we are doing, we need to give specifics.

In support of the government I am proud to say that in 1993 for the province of Manitoba alone, almost $130 million has been made available through EIC's programs and services. This will help to ensure that Manitobans can and will gain the training and work experience they need to find lasting and rewarding employment.

In Manitoba, as part of our ongoing priorities for 1993–94, EIC will continue to help laid–off workers through significant labour adjustment measures. We will look to improving access to our funding for aboriginal peoples, through Pathways. We will continue on with the reselection of Community Futures communities.

We recognize that youth unemployment in Manitoba and across this country is at an unacceptable level now. Accordingly this government has a number of programs available that will help our youth receive the best service possible. Some of EIC's youth initiatives include the Summer Employment/Experience Development, the SEED program; the Stay–in–School, SIS initiative; and the Co–operative Education Program.

In 1993 this government will spend approximately $6 million in Manitoba on the Stay–in–School initiative and SEED which is an increase of approximately $250 million from 1992.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): It being 5.52 o'clock p.m., pursuant to order made Monday, June 7, 1993, the House stands adjourned until Monday, June 14, 1993 at eleven o'clock a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

The House adjourned at 5.52 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, June 14, 1993

The House met at 11 a.m.

Prayers

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

FISHERIES

GRAND BANKS

The House resumed from Wednesday, March 17, consideration of the motion of Mr. Mifflin:

> That, in the opinion of this House, the government should take immediate action to extend custodial jurisdiction for northern cod over the nose and tail of the Grand Banks.

Hon. Roger C. Simmons (Burin—St. George's): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of a motion of my friend and colleague from Newfoundland, from Bonavista—Trinity—Conception. Let us remind ourselves what the motion says.

> That, in the opinion of this House, the government should take immediate action to extend custodial jurisdiction for northern cod over the nose and tail of the Grand Banks.

This is not a new idea but it is a timely one. That is why my colleague said in the motion that immediate action should be taken. The time for delaying any further on this one is gone. It is not justified. We ought to move.

I was looking back over the transcript of the earlier interventions in this debate. A couple of things immediately leaped out at me. One was the remarks of my good friend, the parliamentary secretary for fisheries and oceans. He said in part that the Prime Minister has played a key role. Indeed, the Prime Minister has played a key role in this. I will come back to that in a moment.

First, I want to make reference to some words by my good friend from Nanaimo—Cowichan who I see in the Chamber. He said in part: "This is not a new problem. It has existed for a decade and a half at least." As so often with the members in the NDP, they are half right. He said two things. "This is not a new problem" and he is right. Then he went on to say: "The problem has existed for a decade and a half".

• (1110)

I say to him, not quite, but I understand where he was going. Listen to the next sentence and you will see what is always and forever the NDP agenda. The next sentence says: "We have had Liberal governments and we have had Conservative governments and both have given assurances that the problem is being worked on". I say to him that is a good line. It is a great line and part of their continuing strategy to lump us all together. The facts have never really stood in the way of members of the NDP when they wanted to do that. Let us look at the facts. He says: "The problem has existed for a decade and a half". In other words 15 years, and that would take us back to about 1978.

He will want to check the facts on this but we did not have overfishing on the nose and tail of the Grand Banks in 1978. The reason we did not have overfishing at that time was because of the Liberal government of the day led by Mr. Trudeau and the efforts spearheaded by the late Don Jamieson whom I succeeded in this particular seat of Burin—St. George's. These men and others in the cabinet of that day succeeded in getting the jurisdiction extended to 200 miles. With it and with NAFO, the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization, there came a very orderly pursuit of the fishery by all the countries involved, including the countries of the European Community, particularly Spain and Portugal.

The gentleman from Nanaimo—Cowichan has access to this information, he reads well and he knows this information. He skated on it here but he knows the information. The information is clear. It is not in dispute. It is information from the statistics of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans. For the year 1978–79, which he was talking about, there was no foreign overfishing. The Spanish stayed within their quotas. The French stayed

within their quotas. The Portuguese stayed within their quotas. Everybody without exception stayed within their quotas from 1978 to 1984.

The quota for the cod stock we are talking about in this resolution in 1984, for example, for the European Community was 23,200 metric tons and that is what the Europeans took. They stayed within quota.

What did they do the next year, 1985? There is the rub. In 1985 the quota for the European Community was also 23,200 metric tons and they took 172,000 metric tons. They took eight times their quota. In 1986, they took 12 times their quota.

Has the problem existed for a decade and a half? No, I say with respect to my friend from Nanaimo—Cowichan. It was a good point to try to lump the Tories and Liberals together again. It is a good try and a good NDP tactic, but as most NDP tactics it is fairly hollow and not based on a lot of facts. I say to the hon. member, the problem did not begin a decade and a half ago.

The problem began nine years ago and that is where I now come back to the earlier original quote by my friend the parliamentary secretary who said: "The Prime Minister has played a key role". Indeed he has played a key role in this one. The new prime minister to be, the now minister of defence, did play a key role as did others.

I come from an evangelical tradition in which we talk not only about the sins of commission but also the sins of omission. It is one thing to do the things you should not have done but it is equally wrong to omit to do the things you should do, the sins of omission.

The gentleman from Baie Comeau, the Prime Minister; the lady from Vancouver, the prime minister-designate; the runner-up in the weekend leadership, the Minister of the Environment; the minister of fisheries from Newfoundland, and I could name others, by their sin of omission, by failing to do something about this problem, allowed the problem to come to the impasse it is at today.

• (1115)

We have to be particularly critical of the people who have been here since 1984. I recognize that the lady from Vancouver did not make it here until 1988. She became somewhat of an accomplice after the fact. She continued to aid and abet the sin of omission. However the gentleman from Baie Comeau, the Prime Minister, and the gentleman from St. John's West, the minister of fisheries, are the people who, as my friend the parliamentary secretary unwittingly said, played the key role by standing idly by and allowing the European Community, the Spanish and the Portuguese to take eight times their quota in 1985 and 12 times their quota in 1986. That is the key role they played and that is the key role we will not allow them to forget.

Why present this motion now? This is not the first time we have presented such a motion. I moved a similar motion in March 1992. We have been trying for some time. The reason I moved it in March 1992 was that I took some encouragement from the words of my friend, the minister of fisheries. While he did not say it in the House, he did say outside the House that he foresaw that the taking of custodial management would be the only alternative. That was what he was telling his friends in Newfoundland in small groups. We never could get him to say it here but he said it in fairly public ways back in Newfoundland.

It is only a 10-minute speech and I have received the signal that already, although I was just warming to the subject and getting comfortable with it, my time is just about up. Good morning. We are here every Monday morning this time. Thank you for dropping in. Good to see you.

The point of this resolution is that the time has come to act. The time has come for us to do what has to be done. We have tried every other route, and we are not advocating that we abandon any other routes. Let us keep talking if that helps. If more diplomacy does something then let us do it. In the meantime, let us now give notice that we are tired of waiting, we can no longer have our fishery pillaged and we can no longer stand idly by while thousands of our fish plant workers and fishermen are walking around jobless, not because they are lazy but because there are no fish out there.

Why are there no fish out there? It is because the Spanish, the Portuguese and the French have taken them. Why have they taken them? They have taken them because of the key role played by the Prime Minister in standing idly by for years and years and allowing it to happen. We are saying in this resolution that the time for that kind of key role is over and the time for standing idly by is over.

The time has come now for people of good will, for people of all parties to get behind the fishermen on the south coast of Newfoundland and throughout Atlantic Canada, to get behind those plant workers, to stand up for our sovereignty, to protect our fish stocks and do what has to be done to now assume custodial management over those stocks. They are really our stocks. I know they spend some time on the nose and tail of the Grand Banks but they are our stocks. This is the vehicle by which we can move.

I invite members of all parties to join with us in this important resolution.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Charles A. Langlois (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and to Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased this morning to take a few minutes to talk about the motion of the hon. member who represents a riding in Newfoundland. Of course, this issue of fisheries is of particular interest to me because the eastern part of the riding I represent is heavily dependent on the groundfish fishery.

[*English*]

I would like to take a few minutes to address the House on this issue due to the fact that several communities in the eastern part of my riding, in the area known as the lower north shore, are dependent on groundfish activities, mainly codfish. I would like to point out some facts relevant to this issue.

The Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency has risen in this House on more than one occasion to describe what would happen if Canada unilaterally extended its jurisdiction for cod or any other species beyond our 200-mile limit. Such gunboat diplomacy may be in violation of international agreements.

• (1120)

It would invite retaliatory action and it would threaten the co-operation we are succeeding in obtaining from many states in our efforts to develop rules for fisheries that would promote sustainable development of the fish resources on the high seas.

I am surprised that this motion has been put forward at this particular time when Canada and other like-minded states are preparing for their participation in the United Nations Conference on High Seas Fisheries.

The conference held its organizational meeting April 8 to 23 in New York City. Its first substantive session will be held in New York City from July 12 to 30. The conference is expected to complete its work no later than the fall of 1994. If it is successful it could go down in history as a major step toward conservation of straddling and highly migratory fish stocks.

[*Translation*]

This international conference is crucial not only for Canada but also for the rest of the world because, like many other maritime nations, Canada is now going through a serious crisis in the fishery. Scientific indicators show that the biomass of northern cod has reached a critical low, which has led the Canadian government to impose a moratorium on fishing for this species on the Grand Banks of Newfoundland. It has been supported in this by the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization, on behalf of its 14 contracting parties. In the past six years, with accumulating scientific evidence showing that the biomass of various other regulated stocks is below the threshold of viable harvesting, the quotas have been lowered every year.

[*English*]

All the members of this House are well aware of the costs of these declines in terms of unemployed people and plant closures. As members of this House know, we have initiated compensation and retraining programs for unemployed fishermen and plant workers as an industry restructuring program.

However Canada is not the only nation faced with declining fish stocks. This is the fate of straddling stocks in many other parts of the world: hake in the southwest Atlantic on Argentina's Patagonian shelf; orange roughy on the Challenger Plateau off New Zealand; blue whiting and jack mackerel in the east central and southeast Pacific off Chile and Peru; and pollock in the so-called doughnut hole in the central Bering Sea between Russia and the United States.

This is also happening in the Sea of Japan where exclusive economic zones have not been established and

the high seas begin at the limit of the 12-mile territorial sea. However some positive steps were taken in 1992.

While there are several causes for these stock declines including, in Canada's case, climatic change, a major factor has been unremitting and undisciplined overfishing by distant water fishing fleets. No matter how well coastal states manage straddling or highly migratory stocks inside their own waters they have no control over what happens to those stocks when they migrate to the high seas where they are subject to over-harvesting by distant fishing fleets.

The specific rights of coastal states and the obligations of the high seas fishing states are only vaguely sketched out in the Law of the Sea. The resultant legal uncertainty leaves these stocks vulnerable to overfishing on the high seas by fleets from distant water states.

To resolve these tragic situations the UN conference on high seas fisheries must result in an effective regime for the conservation and management of straddling stocks and highly migratory species. By effective I mean a regime that is workable and that does the job it is intended to do, which is to allow depleted stocks to renew themselves to levels of sustainable development.

[*Translation*]

Since 1989, Canada has made a whole series of high level diplomatic efforts to stop foreign overfishing in its economic zone. The Canadian government would like to establish better international co-operation to conserve fish stocks straddling the 200-mile line, especially cod, halibut and ocean perch, which are being relentlessly overfished outside its economic zone. The Prime Minister, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and other federal ministers have had discussions with the leaders and fisheries officials of several countries to convince them of the need to stop overfishing.

[*English*]

These initiatives have achieved several notable successes in the past year and a half. The European Community stopped fishing for northern cod on the nose of the Grand Banks at the beginning of June 1992. An agreement between Canada and the European Community, announced on December 21, 1992, has been hailed as a victory for common sense and sound conservation.

• (1125)

The European Community and Canada agreed to comply with all NAFO conservation and management decisions, including quotas. From 1986 to 1992 the European Community set for itself unilateral quotas higher than those set for it by NAFO.

The European Community will ensure that catches by its fleets do not exceed NAFO quotas. From 1986 to 1991 EC catches exceeded most NAFO quotas and in some cases the European Community's higher unilateral quotas.

Canada and the European Community will work together to end fishing by non-NAFO fleets. These fleets, largely comprising Korean and re-flagged European Community vessels, have become an increasingly serious threat to resources outside the 200-mile limit.

Canada and the European Community will work together to revitalize NAFO through joint proposals to add a dispute settlement mechanism to avoid abuse of the objection procedure.

Canada will set a total allowable catch for northern cod based on advice from Canadian and international scientists. Scientific advice indicates that on average 5 per cent of the biomass is outside the 200-mile limit. Canada and the European Community will propose that NAFO make allocations of 2J3KL cod equal to 5 per cent of the total allowable catch. Canada will retain 95 per cent of the TAC.

As the European Community will now be co-operating with Canada in conservation of fisheries resources outside the 200-mile limit, as soon as both parties have given formal approval Canada will treat the European Community in a non-discriminatory manner regarding access to ports, any surplus allocations and any commercial arrangements.

If problems arise with the agreement there will be consultations to seek to resolve them. Either Canada or the European Community can terminate the agreement on 60 days notice.

[*Translation*]

At the annual meeting in September 1992, all contracting parties of the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization agreed to comply with the ban on fishing for northern cod within the Canadian economic zone. In addition, the European Community announced that it

intended to respect all the resource management decisions which NAFO would make in 1993.

At their meeting, the contracting parties also approved new management and surveillance measures to be implemented in 1993, including the imposition of a new minimum mesh size and minimum landing sizes. Furthermore, as part of an experiment, NAFO observers will be put on board ships of each contracting party.

I think that Canada in recent years has implemented measures to protect migratory groundfish stocks and of course to ensure as well that our Atlantic fishing industry will survive the present difficult period, while permitting the industry, fishermen and plant workers to meet their needs and continue to support their families.

[*English*]

I would like to assure the House that the Government of Canada is taking every step possible to ensure the sustainable viability of the fisheries sector. I do not think that taking custody of the nose and tail of the Grand Banks would help Canada to achieve the goals that we have set for ourselves and for our industry.

Hon. William Rompkey (Labrador): Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to congratulate my colleague from Bonavista—Trinity—Conception on bringing this bill forward and having this debate today. I share his sentiments. I believe this is a measure that we must take now, simply because nothing else has worked. We are left with the only option we have, as far as I can see.

He is behind this and I congratulate him for bringing it forward. It would be very interesting to know where his opponent stands on this bill. His opponent is the former minister of fisheries from Newfoundland who went to Europe time after time to try to convince the Europeans of our case and try to get them to stop overfishing. He did that time after time and he failed. I failed. We all failed. The Minister of Fisheries and Oceans failed. Everybody who tried negotiations failed.

It seems to me that it is very important to know where he stands. Does he support this, or does he support the government in saying: "No, we must not take possession of the jurisdiction of the nose and tail of the Grand Banks. We must just continue to negotiate and try to talk our way out of this. We must just try to invoke international agreements to our benefit". Does he take that position or does he take the position of the Conservative opposition members in Newfoundland? They believe that not only must we take jurisdiction over the nose and tail of the Grand Banks, but we must call in the navy, not just the Canadian navy but the American navy as well.

• (1130)

I listened to an interview with Mr. Matthews, the Official Opposition critic for fisheries in Newfoundland, on CBC radio two weeks ago. He said very clearly that the time had come to stop talking. On that day there were 103 foreign vessels fishing just outside the 200-mile limit. There were 103 foreign trawlers, mostly Spanish and Portuguese, fishing outside the 200-mile limit on the nose and tail of the Grand Banks. It was after the election so there was obviously no election agenda, no election ploy and no votes to be gained. He said very clearly that the time had come to stop talking. The time had come to not simply take jurisdiction but to bring in the navy to enforce that jurisdiction.

He is right because this is our only option. Why is it our only option? Because this is our life. What is happening in our province now and I suspect will start to happen throughout other parts of the Atlantic region too is that we are bleeding to death. In terms of our life, our culture and in terms of what we are about as a people and what we have been, we are bleeding to death. Somehow or other we have to stop that.

I listened to the hon. member as he said: "What would happen if we did retaliate, if we did take this action? Would they not retaliate?" That seems to be the same as the Muslims saying: "If the Serbs attack we must not fight back otherwise they will retaliate", or in Somalia if the Somali war-lords attack the UN the UN must not attack back otherwise the Somali war-lords might retaliate. Sure they are going to retaliate. We have been attacked and we must fight back.

The hon. member knows just as well as I do because of where he comes from that this is our life. He knows that. He knows that this is the life of the Quebec north shore. He and I share a constituency. The people who fish north of Blanc-Sablon and the people who fish south of Blanc-Sablon share that way of life and have no option. It seems to me we have a responsibility to protect those people who cannot protect themselves. They are the real victims of overfishing because they have not been able to

catch those fish inshore and they also have no alternatives.

I want to get back to what I said about the present situation. As a result of the moratorium we have people drifting in our province now. They see no future in the road ahead. They are confused and frustrated. Some are even getting into a situation of despair about the future. Those are the people we have a responsibility to protect.

Regarding the EC agreement, we have talked to the European Community and we have some things written on paper. However, it is very clear the European Community has no control over Portugal and Spain. That is obvious.

Not only does the European Community have no control in North American waters, it has no control in European waters. My impression is that what is happening off the coast of Norway is the same as what is happening off the coast of Newfoundland. The European Community can put all it likes on paper, but it cannot back it up. It cannot put that agreement into effect because it has no real control.

The European Community at the present time is completely immersed in its own agenda. It has problems of its own. It has to try to draw some unity out of the disparate states that presently make up Europe. I hope it succeeds in doing that, but that is where its focus and energy is and that is where its problems are.

The European Community does not see this as a top priority problem at the present time. Neither does it presently have the means to enforce any agreements it makes with Canada. Those agreements are not worth the paper they are written on. If the government is putting all its hopes on the agreements that we have and the fact that we may be able to talk the Europeans into living up to those agreements, I think it is a false hope. I think that is an empty hope. It is a hope that has proven to be ineffective.

• (1135)

As I said at the beginning, we have tried all other options. We have tried discussion. We have tried diplomacy. We have tried agreements. They have not worked.

At the present time people who depend almost wholly and solely on the fishery, people who are vulnerable, people who have no alternatives, people who have seen their resource destroyed through no fault of their own are now asking what we are going to do about it. They want to know if we are going to take meaningful action or if we are going to continue talking.

The only answer is the one the member for Bonavista—Trinity—Conception has put forward today. The government has to listen to this debate. It must take it seriously and act on the suggestion that has been put forward. It seems it is the only answer for us. I hope that the House as a whole will take this seriously, see the wisdom of this motion and support it.

Mr. George S. Baker (Gander—Grand Falls): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words concerning this motion. The person who has moved the motion is the hon. member for Bonavista—Trinity—Conception. Bonavista Bay, Trinity Bay and Conception Bay are three bays, enormous areas on the east coast of Newfoundland.

The hon. member for Bonavista—Trinity—Conception represents practically the entire east coast fleet of Newfoundland. That fleet involves very small vessels compared to the foreign vessels we are talking about today.

The hon. member for Bonavista—Trinity—Conception perhaps knows more about the ocean than any other member in this Chamber. He was a rear admiral in the Canadian navy. There are only five rear admirals in the entire country, a couple of them on the east coast. However, the hon. member for Bonavista—Trinity—Conception was a rear admiral in our navy.

The zone he is talking about trying to kick the foreign vessels out of is the nose and the tail of the Grand Banks. Why it is called the nose and the tail, I do not know. It does not look like a tail and it does not look like a nose. I suppose the nose and chin might be better. However, the nose and the tail are the two areas that lie outside the 200-mile zone.

About 5 per cent of Canada's continental shelf goes outside of the 200-mile economic zone. It is those two areas that this motion is about. The motion reads that Canada should extend jurisdiction and kick out all of those foreign vessels fishing on the nose and the tail of the Grand Banks, that 5 per cent of our continental shelf outside the 200-mile zone. Who is out there? Canada is the only country in the world today that has foreign

vessels fishing on its continental shelf without permission.

The last country which allowed that to happen was Namibia in Africa. Little Namibia turned around a year and a half ago and said to Spain and Portugal: "If you do not get off of our continental shelf we are going to send out our warship". It did not even have a warship. I understand it had a 30-foot vessel with a 12-gauge mounted on the front. Namibia went out there with that 12-gauge and shot a couple of shots across the bow. That is what happened a year and a half ago. That is history. One hundred and fifteen Spanish factory freezer trawlers left Namibia and went to the nose and tail of the Grand Banks of Canada with no objection from the Canadian government.

• (1140)

These are foreign factory freezer trawlers 400-feet long. We do not have one factory freezer trawler in Canada, not one. Well, there was one brought over from Europe, the *Cape North*, however we do not have any that are fishing. Why? We do not allow that technology in Canada because it destroys our environment. It destroys the bottom of the ocean. It destroys the spawning grounds. It really destroys the fishing resource.

It takes 15 years for a flatfish living on the nose and tail of the Grand Banks to reach maturity and reproduce. It takes that same fish six years off the European coast. Therefore when a spawning ground is destroyed off the Canadian coast it is being destroyed for a long time. That is the reason for this motion presented by the hon. member for Bonavista—Trinity—Conception.

What has been the response of the Canadian government? I will tell you what it has been. There has been a press release. What did the press release by the Government of Canada this summer say? I will table it. It said: "In 1993, 50,700 tonnes of fish"—which is enough to keep five fish plants going the whole year round, and this is from external affairs—"will be allocated to foreign countries inside our 200-mile zone."

Starting now, we allow foreigners this summer to come inside our 200-mile zone and fish 50,700 tonnes of fish with those factory freezer trawlers. We will leave them alone on the nose and tail. We will also allow them in to catch enough fish to keep five fish plants going year round in Canada.

On top of that, what else? Before the minister made that statement, there was a dandy one called domestic allocations. He listed 17 Canadian companies from British Columbia, to the north, to the east, to the central region, that are allowed to fish in 1993 inside Canada's 200-mile zone using foreign vessels.

One hundred of the same factory freezer trawlers today that are outside the 200-mile zone destroying our fishing resource are now going to come inside as well, hired by Canadian companies. On top of that, there are 50,000 tonnes just to the foreigners themselves inside 200 miles.

We look at these observer reports. One observer report is marked "secret" but it sure ain't secret after it gets in my hands, not from fisheries and oceans. What does this secret report say about these foreign vessels?

A foreign vessel is catching argentine. I have never seen an argentine; it is like a large smelt. I have seen a smelt, a silvery smelt. It is like a large smelt. It swims in the middle of the ocean. What did this factory freezer trawler from Russia and one from Cuba catch? This fellow caught 5.6 tonnes of crabs. What was he doing, digging for oil? Crabs crawl along the bottom of the ocean. He was fishing in the middle of the ocean. He caught 25 tonnes of lobster.

I did not know crabs could swim. Lobster can a little bit, backward.

An hon. member: Like the Tories.

Mr. Baker: No, they can't even swim. To complicate matters, 1,000 tonnes of herring were caught. Herring swims on top of the ocean.

So we have foreign vessels trying to catch fish in the middle of the ocean catching crabs on the bottom of the ocean and catching herring on top of the ocean. They must be using a vacuum cleaner. That is what they are using, two-inch mesh size, raking the bottom of the ocean floor for as far as they can go and the Canadian government allows them to go everywhere: on the nose and tail, inside, around.

• (1145)

Meanwhile Canadians are sitting back, getting their packages. Canadian fishermen are not allowed to put a net in the water. Our small boat fishermen and our fish plant workers at home doing nothing have to be paid by the taxpayers of Canada. Why? Because we bend over backward to every other nation in this world. External affairs runs the whole show. Where are they going to have cocktails tomorrow? That is what governs our policy when it comes to the fishery. It is a disgraceful situation.

I think all members of this House, regardless of political affiliation, should vote in favour of this motion by Rear Admiral Mifflin who is now the MP for Bonavista—Trinity—Conception. They should vote for the motion and send a signal to external affairs that we are fed up and we are not going to put up with this any more.

Mr. Francis G. LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso): Mr. Speaker, could I have an indication of how many minutes I have, please?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Five minutes.

Mr. LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso): Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to just pick up from the discussion of my learned colleague from Gander—Grand Falls on the points that he was making in his speech. I have heard my colleague on numerous occasions speak in this House and outside of this House about the problems of overfishing both outside and inside of our 200-mile zone. He has a very interesting, entertaining and colourful way of making what is a very serious and very important point.

I think the point bears directly on this issue that has been raised by my colleague from Bonavista—Trinity—Conception who did a great deal of research prior to putting forward this motion on the whole issue, legal, ecological and fisheries related, to justify our taking this step of extending functional jurisdiction in these areas.

There is no question that the research has been done. We have been patient as a country for far too long with the kind of pillaging which is taking place on the nose and tail of the Grand Banks of Canada. It is time finally that this government or the successor government act on this very important issue. It may well be too late, but it is certainly time.

I would like in the short time that I have available to raise an issue which is central to this whole debate. The issue is the distinction between what has traditionally been called utilized and under-utilized species of fish which are considered to be in excess of the needs or the capacity of Canadians to catch them.

When the 200-mile limit was declared by Canada in 1977 one of the ways in which our government at the time proceeded in order to obtain compliance from other countries and co-operation from them in not overfishing our stocks was to make it possible for these countries to catch fish which were considered to be surplus to Canadian needs. They were fish which Canadian technology could not catch at the time or which Canadian consumers could not consume, so other countries were allowed under permits by Canada to come inside our zone and fish these so-called surplus species. In addition we were hoping at the time and I think the hope was well placed that other countries would behave and co-operate outside of the 200-mile zone in the areas where there are fishing activities, principally on the nose and tail of the Grand Banks.

• (1150)

As we have seen, and it is particularly sad to say, since this government took office there has obviously been no co-operation by those vessels fishing outside our zone. The result is that the fish stocks in those areas have been decimated.

It raises a very profound and fundamental question. The question I want to bring to the floor of the House in the very brief time I have available is the distinction between under-utilized and utilized species.

I think we as a government and as a country have to begin to question the validity of that distinction because we are now learning that really all fish in the water are related in an ecological sense.

To declare, for example, that capelin is an under-utilized species and therefore can be fished by a foreign government is no longer relevant because capelin is a food fish for other fish which we use. Other fish in the

water live in the environment with the fish that are our traditional species.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): You have 10 seconds to finish.

Mr. LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso): My point quite simply is a plea to begin to re-examine, reassess and question this fundamental distinction which has been used to allow foreign fishing in and around our 200-mile limit. That distinction is no longer valid and relevant in this day and age.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): It being 11.51 a.m. o'clock and pursuant to Standing Order 93 the time provided for debate has expired. Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Call in the members.

And the bells having rung:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay (Québec-Est): Mr. Speaker, you will surely obtain unanimous consent from the members of this House to defer the vote on the private bill of the hon. member for Bonavista—Trinity—Conception to the same time as the scheduled vote on the time allocation motion for Bill C-110, that is 12.30 p.m.

Mr. Mifflin: I agree with my colleague's proposal.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Agreed and so ordered.

Division on motion deferred.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

NORTHUMBERLAND STRAIT CROSSING ACT

ALLOCATION OF TIME TO CONSIDER REPORT AND THIRD READING STAGES OF BILL C-110

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons) moved:

That, in relation to Bill C-110, an act respecting the Northumberland Strait Crossing, not more than one further sitting day shall be allotted to the consideration of report stage and one sitting day to the consideration of the third reading stage of the bill; and

That, 15 minutes before the expiry of the time provided for Government Orders on the day allotted to the report stage consideration and on the day allotted to the third reading stage consideration of the said bill, any proceedings before the House shall be interrupted, if required, for the purpose of this order and, in turn, every question necessary to dispose of the stage of the bill then under consideration shall be put forthwith and successively, without further debate or amendment.

• (1155)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Call in the members.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed on the following division:

Private Members' Business

(*Division No. 532*)

YEAS

Members

Anderson	Andre
Attewell	Belsher
Bernier	Bertrand
Bird	Bjornson
Blackburn (Jonquière)	Blais
Blenkarn	Boyer
Brightwell	Browes
Cadieux	Chadwick
Champagne (Champlain)	Chartrand
Clark (Yellowhead)	Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole	Collins
Cooper	Corbeil
Corbett	Côté
Couture	Crosbie (St. John's West)
Danis	Darling
DeBlois	de Cotret
Della Noce	Desjardins
Dick	Dobbie
Domm	Dorin
Duplessis	Edwards
Epp	Fee
Feltham	Ferland
Fontaine	Fretz
Friesen	Gibeau
Greene	Guilbault
Harvey (Chicoutimi)	Hawkes
Hockin	Hogue
Holtmann	Horner
Horning	Hudon
Hughes	Jacques
James	Jelinek
Joncas	Jourdenais
Kempling	Koury
Landry	Langlois
Larrivée	Layton
Lewis	Littlechild
Loiselle	MacKay
Malone	Martin (Lincoln)
Masse	Mayer
Mazankowski	McCreath
McKnight	McLean
Merrithew	Mitges
Monteith	Moore
Nicholson	Oberle
O'Kurley	Porter
Redway	Reid
Reimer	Ricard
Robitaille	Roy-Arcelin
Saint-Julien	Schneider
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)	Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Shields	Siddon
Sobeski	Soetens
Sparrow	Stevenson
Tardif	Thorkelson
Tremblay (Québec-Est)	Valcourt
Van De Walle	Vankoughnet
Vézina	Vien
Vincent	Weiner
Wenman	White
Wilbee	
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)	
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)	Winegard
Worthy—123	

NAYS

Members

Assad	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Baker	Benjamin
Boudria	Brewin
Butland	Catterall
Clancy	Dionne
Ferguson	Flis
Foster	Fulton
Gagliano	Gray (Windsor West)
Harb	Harvard
Heap	Jordan
Langdon (Essex—Windsor)	LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee	Maheu
Manley	Mifflin
Milliken	Nowlan
Nystrom	Ouellet
Rompkey	Samson
Simmons	Skelly (North Island—Powell River)
Speller	Stupich
Young (Acadie—Bathurst)—37	

PAIRED MEMBERS

nil/aucun

• (1235)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Motion agreed to.

As agreed earlier this day, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred division on Motion No. 677 under Private Members' Business.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

FISHERIES

GRAND BANKS

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Mifflin:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should take immediate action to extend custodial jurisdiction for northern cod over the nose and tail of the Grand Banks.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Following the adoption of the 24th report of the Standing Committee on House Management, Wednesday April 29, 1992, the division will be taken row by row starting with the mover and then proceed with those in favour of the motion sitting on the same side of the House as the mover; then those in favour of the motion sitting on the other side of the House will be called. Those opposed to the motion will be called in the same order.

The House divided on the motion, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 533*)

YEAS

Members

Assad	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Baker	Benjamin
Boudria	Brewin
Butland	Catterall
Clancy	Dionne
Ferguson	Flis
Foster	Fulton

Gagliano
Harb
Heap
Langdon (Essex—Windsor)
Lee
Manley
Mifflin
Nystrom
Samson
Skelly (North Island—Powell River)
Stupich
Gray (Windsor West)
Harvard
Jordan
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
Maheu
McGuire
Milliken
Rompkey
Simmons
Speller
Young (Acadie—Bathurst)—36

NAYS

Members

Anderson
Attewell
Bernier
Bird
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Brightwell
Cadieux
Champagne (Champlain)
Clark (Yellowhead)
Cole
Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Danis
DeBlois
Della Noce
Dick
Domm
Duplessis
Epp
Feltham
Fontaine
Friesen
Guilbault
Hawkes
Hogue
Horner
Hudon
Jacques
Jelinek
Jourdenais
Koury
Langlois
Layton
Littlechild
MacKay
Marin
Masse
Mazankowski
McKnight
Merrithew
Monteith
Oberle
Porter
Reid
Ricard
Roy-Arcelin
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Shields
Sobeski
Sparrow
Tardif
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Van De Walle
Vézina
Vincent
Wenman
Wilbee
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)
Worthy—121
Andre
Belsher
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blais
Boyer
Browes
Chadwick
Chartrand
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Collins
Corbeil
Côté
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Darling
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dobbie
Dorin
Edwards
Fee
Ferland
Fretz
Greene
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hockin
Holtmann
Horning
Hughes
James
Joncas
Kempling
Landry
Larrivée
Lewis
Loiselle
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
Mayer
McCreath
McLean
Mitges
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Redway
Reimer
Robitaille
Schneider
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Siddon
Soetens
Stevenson
Thacker
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vien
Weiner
White
Winegard

PAIRED MEMBERS

nil/aucun

• (1245)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I declare the motion lost.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

NORTHUMBERLAND STRAIT CROSSING ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed from Thursday, June 10, consideration of Bill C-110, an act respecting the Northumberland Strait Crossing, as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee; and Motions Nos. 1, 4, 7, 18, 21, 57, 60 and 63.

Hon. Ralph Ferguson (Lambton—Middlesex): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to be given the opportunity to take part in this debate today to establish the fixed link between Prince Edward Island and mainland Canada, a permanent link. The Fathers of Confederation in 1867 came to the agreement that made this nation the country it is and established the foundations of Confederation that have served us so well since that time.

Efforts to connect Prince Edward Island to mainland Canada go back to 1885. Prior to Prince Edward Island joining Canada, the question of the fixed link was first raised in the 1830s. From the 1830s onward summer steam vessels and winter ice boats provided a sporadic kind of link between Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. When Prince Edward Island finally became a province of Canada in the spring of 1873, one of the terms of confederation dealt with that link. In it Canada assumed a constitutional obligation to provide a continuous connection to the mainland. The terms of union clause reads:

> That the Dominion Government shall assume and defray all charges for the following services, vis., efficient steam service for the conveyance of mails and passengers to be established and maintained between the island and the mainland in the Dominion in winter and summer, thus placing the island in continuous communication with the intercolonial railroad and the railroad system of the Dominion.

In 1885 the idea of a tunnel under the Northumberland Strait was proposed. This was supposed to ensure year round communication. The tunnel concept was studied and analysed off and on for the next 30 years but never really got beyond that stage.

In 1966 construction was actually begun on a bridge-causeway combination. Access roads were built. Before work on the actual bridge-causeway got started the project was scrapped. That is when the province of Prince Edward Island signed a development agreement with the federal government in lieu of continuing with the causeway bridge concept.

The latest round of discussions began with a Public Works study in 1982. On January 18, 1988 Islanders voted. The results were 60 per cent in favour of the link and 40 per cent opposed.

On June 10, the premier of Prince Edward Island, a former member of this House whom I respect and admire not only because I know her and the work she did here in the Parliament of Canada and her principles and dedication to hard work, took on the premier's mantle in Prince Edward Island as the first elected lady premier in this country. She introduced a measure before the Prince Edward Island legislature to comply with a March court ruling and these measures clear the last obstacle for this project.

• (1250)

The Northumberland Strait crossing project, or as it is commonly called the fixed link, is without a doubt the single most important project to be undertaken involving Prince Edward Island since it joined the Canadian Confederation.

It is estimated that over 90 studies have been conducted on various aspects of the project. Most of these were in the last five or six years. Since 1987 there have been 55 studies by Public Works Canada on the Northumberland Strait crossing project itself. There have been 19 studies done by Public Works Canada for the Northumberland Strait bridge project and the concept assessment supplement, including documents. There have been 4 studies through FEARO and related reports. There were 3 miscellaneous reports, 7 through Environment Canada and related documents and 4 from Strait Crossing Incorporated and related reports. This does not include the days when the causeway was being considered or the days when the tunnel was considered back at the turn of the century and even earlier.

Prior to the vote former Premier Ghiz wrote to the public works minister, Stewart McInnis, November 6, 1987—that was the actual date of the letter— and indicated on behalf of the Government of Prince Edward Island that the support for the link was contingent upon the satisfactory address of 10 principles. The 10 principles had to do with: highways; the Woods Island ferry; the submerged lands; tolls and how they would be arrived at; the displaced workers at Borden-Cape Tormentine; economic development for the town of Borden; the Atlantic content in the materials that would be used and the labour required; an environmental impact study; the fisheries that were very important to Prince Edward Island and the utilities. That was the utility corridor to be used at no cost to the province.

These 10 points have been addressed to the satisfaction of both Premier McKenna and former Premier Ghiz. On the list of concerns the environment has moved to the fore. In fact the environment has always been one of the main concerns of building a fixed link of any sort across the Northumberland Strait. To show environmental compliance the following clauses were included in the federal-provincial agreement. I think these clauses are extremely important and I will quote them in their entirety. Clause 6(1) reads:

> Public participation in the federal Environmental Assessment and Review Process, commonly known as EARP, was undertaken to the satisfaction of Canada, P.E.I., and New Brunswick.
>
> Canada through its Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Environment Canada and Transport Canada, in conjunction with the provinces of P.E.I. and New Brunswick, had deemed that a fixed crossing can be constructed in an environmentally friendly and acceptable manner.

Clause 6(2) reads:

> The construction and operation of the fixed crossing shall comply with the environmental laws, regulation and relevant environmental codes of practice of the provinces of New Brunswick and P.E.I. and the government of Canada, as well as other specific requirements identified by means of the evaluation conducted under the federal Environmental Assessment and Review Process.

Clause 6(3) reads:

> As a condition of the coming into effect of this agreement and prior to financial closing, the developer must obtain the necessary approvals under provincial and applicable federal environmental assessment legislation and complete an environmental management plan acceptable to Canada, New Brunswick, P.E.I. and the province of Nova Scotia.

In conclusion I do not think we can underestimate the positive economic impact that a fixed link would have on Prince Edward Island. Everything indicates that if we are to improve or even maintain our standard of living we must also become more self-sufficient. We must have a greater degree of economic independence and we must become more competitive. An improved transportation system is crucial to Prince Edward Island becoming more competitive whether it is for manufacturing, the processing sector, the agricultural sector, the fishing industry or tourism.

• (1255)

Economic activity will grow not only during construction but in the years afterward. The link will generate industrial expansion and create jobs. The link will generate growth and tourism. It will create jobs for that region of Canada.

I have always been very proud as a Canadian to sit in the House with colleagues from every province of Canada. This time is no exception. I am very proud of the people in Prince Edward Island and their contribution to the development of this nation.

It makes a lot of sense that we should work to pass this bill and let them establish a permanent, long-lasting, meaningful link to bring together the seat of Confederation with the rest of this country to pull it together at this time of uncertainty ahead of us.

Hon. William Rompkey (Labrador): Mr. Speaker, I really want to take up where my colleague left off and say that indeed one of the primary reasons for building the fixed link to Prince Edward Island is to join together the mainland of Canada with Prince Edward Island which was the birthplace of Confederation.

We who live in the east, and not necessarily those of us who live in Labrador but those of us who live or have lived on the island of Newfoundland from time to time, know something about islands, distance, isolation and the need for togetherness.

I fully applaud the efforts of those people on P.E.I. and here too on both sides of this House who initiated this project. There is a need to do this project.

I am satisfied as many others are that environmental precautions have been taken and that the proper environmental hearings have been held. The environment is naturally a concern. We must study that. We must examine it. We must make sure it is protected. However there are other things that must be protected too and those are the lives, homes, livelihood and future of the people who live on Prince Edward Island.

What they need is an opportunity to compete in Canada and indeed in the global marketplace. If they are to compete in terms of the resources that they have, which include fish, potatoes and tourism, they need infrastructure. My leader and my party have been speaking very strongly about the need to put in place infrastructure in terms of the various parts of this country that need it.

That means roads, bridges, wharfs, water and sewer services. In this case it means a surface link to the mainland so that P.E.I. can both attract goods and services that come to it and send back to the mainland of Canada goods and services that it has to offer.

That is of fundamental importance so that the people on Prince Edward Island can compete. It is important in other parts of Atlantic Canada too. What I like about this move and what we have before us today is that it can be a model for building infrastructure in other parts of the Atlantic and indeed in other parts of the country.

The model is not new. Where I have lived from time to time on the island of Newfoundland we have traded boats for roads before. There was a time when we did not have on the island of Newfoundland a road across the island. There was a time when we did not have roads down the various peninsulas. All of the island was served from the sea by boats.

The Government of Canada in 1949 took on that responsibility and has been subsidizing that sea service. Where I live in Labrador we still have that sea service as well. We still get our goods and materials by sea from the island of Newfoundland. We have the beginning of a road in Labrador but we do not have a road across Labrador.

• (1300)

We do have the beginnings of a road from Labrador City to Goose Bay. This year we have shown that the use of that road has reduced our costs in Goose Bay by 30 per cent. By bringing in our goods and materials over that road, mostly from the province of Quebec but hopefully from other parts of Canada too, we have reduced our

cost of living in Goose Bay and in the central part of Labrador by 30 per cent.

What I like about this particular measure that is before us in the House today is that it provides a model whereby we can think about other forms of infrastructure too. In my own area I would like to see us examine this model and apply it to the Labrador situation. We need that road if we are going to compete.

The way to get that road at a time of restraint and fiscal difficulty is to use whatever means we have at our disposal. One of the means that we have at our disposal is Marine Atlantic. I know that there are people who work with that service and who have given yeoman service over the years. They are people who have given the kind of service that if we did not have it then we would be very badly off indeed. We have been served well by Marine Atlantic.

Today costs are escalating such as the cost of fuel and capital construction. We realize that the cost of building a ship today is in the hundreds of millions of dollars. When government is faced with that kind of cost for continuing a marine service, then it is effective, expedient, useful and the best option to put that kind of money into a surface link. That will happen in P.E.I. I believe that when this link is built in P.E.I. it will experience the same savings that we have started to experience in Labrador.

I hope that in Labrador we can continue the construction of the Trans-Labrador Highway right down to the Strait of Belle Isle so that we have a road right across Labrador. The way to build that road, and it will cost hundreds of millions of dollars, is to make use of the Marine Atlantic subsidies.

The pattern and the model that is being used in P.E.I. is to go to the private sector and ask an engineering consortium to raise the capital in the marketplace and build the link. We would pay it over a period of 25 years with the money that we would normally have put into Marine Atlantic.

I want to take that model and apply it elsewhere and say to other engineering firms that if they were to go to the marketplace and raise the money and build a road across Labrador we would be able to eliminate maybe not all, but a great part of our marine service. This is a marine service that is getting increasingly expensive. We would be able to eliminate that and we would take those subsidies that we have been paying into those services. We would take the capital cost that we would have to pay out for new ships and pay it to the private contractors over a period of 25 years. In that way we can have our surface link too.

This is an important measure. An important measure for Prince Edward Island. I want to support it for that reason. I believe it needs this kind of infrastructure in order to make it competitive in modern society. I like it too because it provides a model that we can use elsewhere to build other forms of infrastructure in the Atlantic. Other roads and surface links in the Atlantic will be important to us and will allow us to compete in the 1990s and on into the 20th century.

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I am happily joining this debate today because I think that the superficial speeches that we have been hearing, particularly from the Liberals, avoid the reality of what is going on constitutionally and environmentally in terms of this project.

Members of this House should be aware that the assembly in Prince Edward Island has only just moved by Walter McEwen and seconded by Catherine Callbeck an amendment to the Constitution that deals with the guts of this matter. This is not going to be dealt with until tomorrow night.

I do not think that we should forget that the Federal Court of Canada, Madam Justice Barbara Reed, has made several orders in relation to this project that certainly the Liberals and the Conservatives seem to want to pay no attention to.

• (1305)

The proposed amendment to the Constitution of Canada that has been tabled in the Prince Edward Island legislature to be dealt with sometime late tomorrow says the following.

The schedule to the Prince Edward Island terms of union is amended by adding thereto after the portion that reads: "and such other charges as may be incident to and connected with the services by which the British North America Act 1867 appertain to the general government and as are or may be allowed to the other provinces" the following: "that a fixed crossing joining the island to the mainland may be substituted for the steam service referred to in this schedule. That for greater certainty nothing in this schedule prevents the imposition of tolls for the use of such a fixed crossing between the island and the mainland or the private operation of such a crossing". This amendment may be

cited as the Constitution Amendment 1993, Prince Edward Island.

We have the Parliament of Canada proceeding to pass Bill C-110 under the constraints of the guillotine before there has been a proper specific assessment of the bridge that is proposed by SCI, Strait Crossing Incorporated, which I would remind this House is 70 per cent foreign-owned in Great Britain and the United States.

I do not think any of us should forget for a moment that the great beneficiaries of the fixed link are not going to be Canadians. They are going to be people who live outside of Canada. MPs from Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick have never bothered to tell any of their constituents about the reality of the beneficiaries should this go ahead.

Let us deal for a moment with this contempt of the people of Canada, of this Chamber proceeding to pass into law something that will tie the taxpayers of Canada over the next 35 years to a contract that will require the provisioning to SCI, Strait Crossing Incorporated, a foreign-owned corporation, $1.47 billion in 1992 dollars: $42 million a year for the next 35 years.

The Constitution of Canada says that the service is to be provided to the people of Prince Edward Island without cost. What are their MPs, Liberal and Conservative, doing? Not only are they abandoning their responsibility to stand up for Canada's Constitution in the Chamber today, the official spokespersons for the Liberal Party have never stood in this Chamber or outside of this Chamber and asked for a full, proper, public environmental assessment and review of the specific bridge proposal.

They are glad to do it in other provinces. They are glad to talk about Clayoquot, they are glad to talk about other issues. When it comes to pandering to a foreign-owned corporation the Liberals know no depth to which they will plummet. They are completely and totally unprincipled in terms of the environmental assessment of this project. Mark my words this will come to haunt the Liberal and Conservative Parties in the years to come.

Let me return to the constitutional matter for a moment because I think we should take a look at just exactly what Madam Justice Barbara Reed had to say. I am quite confident because this matter again goes before the Federal Court later today.

The court will be interested to know just exactly how scurrilous the activities in this Chamber as led by the government House leader have become in terms of this project to pay off SCI. I predict that in the years to come when historians are investigating SCI and its links to members in this Chamber, in particular its links to the government, they are going to find some very interesting facts.

Why is it that this government is prepared to tie the taxpayers of Canada to a bill for $1.47 billion and rise blithely in this House and say that is only the annual costs of providing ferry services between Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick now. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The Auditor General confirmed that last year's costs for that ferry service were $21 million. Why is it that the government plans to give $42 million a year to SCI? This is corruption at its very worst, contempt for the people of Canada on a constitutional issue, contempt by the Liberals and Conservatives on a matter of environmental assessment review. Let no Liberal or Conservative come to my province or any other part of this country and say they stand for environmental assessment and review of major projects. They have let every Canadian down by not standing four square for a full environmental assessment and review of the specific bridge project.

• (1310)

The generic bridge project was turned down by a full panel, rejected out of hand. This is absolutely mad. This has now been buttressed and backed up by the Federal Court ruling. Let me read from the ruling made by Madam Justice Barbara Reed. "It is hereby ordered that the Minister of Public Works, the Minister of Transport, and other representatives of the Government of Canada shall not make any irrevocable decision relating to the specific SCI proposal until after a section 12 decision is made and the documentation relating thereto is released

to the public pursuant to section 15 of the Environmental Assessment Review Process guidelines".

That has not been done. Where are the Liberals? They are reading written speeches. Who were those speeches written by? I suppose they were written by Allan Skales. The Liberals say he is not in a conflict of interest. Come on. He is appearing in a Federal Court action on behalf of the government of Prince Edward Island and he is also the chairman of Marine Atlantic. Give me a break. It is the most blatant conflict of interest one can dream up, but the Liberals are silent about it. The Conservatives are silent about it.

What gives? It is a straight pork-barrel hand-out to SCI, a foreign-owned corporation. Not only do the taxpayers of Canada pay for the whole bridge, give it over to SCI with no risk whatsoever, but the shareholders in this bloody company get to collect tolls on the bridge. At the end of 35 years after ripping off every man, woman and child in P.E.I. and New Brunswick and every other Canadian, they get the tolls. They get all the money for building and maintaining the bridge. After that they give us the bloody bridge back, a rusting hulk, 35 years from now.

There is not a single significant comparative study on the face of this earth that shows that bridge can stand the kinds of ice pressures, winds, weather and high intensity atmosphere that is found in crossing the Northumberland Strait.

We have one of the most intriguing situations of skulduggery and corruption and contempt that I have ever run across. The Liberals in this House during the last debate rose and said they supported environmental assessment and review. Then they very quickly buried that. The MPs from Prince Edward Island leaped all over each other and tried to pull their tongues out, rewrite history, rewrite their speeches and tell everybody that was not what they said. We know they did say it but it is not what they meant.

We know what the Federal Court has said. We know about the sneaky jiggery-pokery going on with Catherine Callbeck and the Tories. Liberals and Tories are no different whatsoever. No Canadian should ever get mixed up about that. These are the twin parties of corruption and contempt on these kinds of environmental and legal matters.

Let us take a look at what Madam Justice Barbara Reed was talking about. On Friday, March 19, 1993, the Federal Court of Canada ruled with respect to the proposed fixed link between P.E.I. and New Brunswick that: "The Minister of Public Works has failed to comply with the requirements of section 12 of the Environmental Assessment Review Process guidelines order". The minister was found to be a failure.

What about this great Minister of the Environment who just ran to be Prime Minister as recently as yesterday. He wrote to me on March 10, 1992 and said: "The requirements of the environmental assessment review process have been fully satisfied with respect to that proposal".

That is not what the court found. That is not what the fishermen in New Brunswick and P.E.I. believe. That is not what the Friends of the Island believe. That is not what any clear-thinking environmentalist or for that matter Canadian citizen would believe in relation to the approach that has been taken.

When we are talking about the Minister of the Environment, where is Bill C-13? We had to sit late nights a year ago. I understand the law list has been shredded in the interests of certain corporate interests.

Let me conclude my remarks in this section of the debate by saying how sad I am that we are now launched on a process that is a contempt of this Parliament. This is contrary to Canada's Constitution as it now reads. Even the constitutional amendment by the P.E.I. legislature will not be dealt with until tomorrow night. The Federal Court made an order that we are heading toward a direct non-compliance. That is contempt in its most vulgar form. We should not be doing these kinds of things. All of this is quite aside from the arguments I will make later today about the environmental aspects of this foolish proposal.

• (1315)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The question is on Motion No. 1. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion the nays have it.

Motion No. 1 negatived.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Accordingly, Motions Nos. 4, 7, 18, 21, 57, 60 and 63 are also negatived on division.

• (1320)

Mrs. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West) moved:

Motion No. 11

That Bill C-110 be amended in clause 4 by striking out line 15 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

"Minister considers desirable, including terms and conditions to avoid or limit adverse environmental effects that may result from the implementation of the agreements".

Mr. Steve Butland (Sault Ste. Marie) moved:

Motion No. 12

That Bill C-110 be amended by deleting clause 4.

Mrs. Catterall: Mr. Speaker, in speaking only on Motion No. 11 I want to make it clear that this motion comes forward at this time because stronger motions with respect to environmental protection moved by my colleagues in committee were ruled out of order.

The position of the Liberal Party on this fixed link has been quite clear for some time now. From the beginning we have said that we are in favour of the fixed link if it can be demonstrated that it can be accomplished without damage to the environment and the fisheries.

On this matter we have on record the statements of the Leader of the Opposition, who happens to be the member of Parliament for the riding in New Brunswick in which the bridge will end. This has also been the consistent position of the premier of New Brunswick and two premiers of Prince Edward Island.

We felt in committee that requiring amendments to the agreement to ensure the protection of the environment, which we have sought, was the appropriate way to go. However those amendments were ruled out of order. Therefore we put forward amendments to ensure that the minister does have the authority, if he chooses to use it, to include environmental conditions in all agreements signed with respect to the Prince Edward Island fixed link.

While this is only permissive legislation that only allows the minister, but does not compel the minister, to include environmental conditions in the agreement we trust that it will ensure that the issue of protection of the environment and protection of our resources will be something that the minister must take into consideration in signing these agreements, now that he has the authority to specifically include conditions.

I want to comment a bit on the process of this project. The federal government, as the courts have now told us, has done as it has on so many other projects and jeopardized this project by its lack of commitment to conduct a full and thorough environmental assessment prior to proceeding with the project. We had this whole issue back before the courts several months ago. The courts, as they have with numerous other projects such as the Oldman River dam and Rafferty-Alameda, told the government that it is disobeying the legislation of this Parliament by not carrying out a full and thorough environmental assessment process.

In this case, the court went the extra step and told the government that it was acting contrary to the Constitution. That failure is being corrected, hopefully in the next 48 hours, by the legislature in Prince Edward Island. However because of the way the government has handled this project from the beginning it is once again before the courts.

We know that the proper way to plan a project and build environmental protection into the project is to do it right at the beginning, not to try to get away with it and try not to do it and then have the courts say that we have to.

• (1325)

The government by its failure to obey the legislation of this Parliament to protect the environment has caused delays and extra costs. It is not going to get away with it. The courts have told the government that when it is not done right the first time it has got to go back and do it all over again.

The government may very well have left a mess for a Liberal government to clean up because this is back in court again. An injunction is being sought to stop the project from proceeding any further pending further environmental studies. We do not know whether or not that court process is going to succeed but we do know

that in failing to carry out its duty this government has put the project at risk of further delays and further costs.

Protection of the environment is something Parliament has mandated. It is something government talks about a great deal. However, on every specific project it has failed to carry out its responsibilities.

With this motion we simply want to make it clear that the minister who will be signing the agreements to carry out this project has the authority to include environmental conditions. That is consistent with the Liberal position. It is consistent with the position of the premiers of the two provinces affected that they want to ensure protection of the environment. We hope the government will support this amendment.

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, anyone who has followed this issue at all knows the position being taken by the Liberals on this issue is contemptuous of the intelligence of everyone in this country. They pretend that giving a minister powers to attach some conditions to a project is in some way a replacement for a full environmental assessment and review of a specific project.

The Liberals might think that everyone in Canada is stupid, but they are not. Some day soon the voters in Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick will reflect upon the fact the Liberals and Conservatives have joined forces to try to obfuscate and sleazily drag this project into being, without it ever meeting the basic constitutional, legal or environmental requirements of this country.

An hon. member: Sleazily. What a great adverb.

Mr. Fulton: It is a good adverb. The Tories and Liberals often operate sleazily.

On Monday, February 8, 1993 this House heard from the member for Moncton speaking for the Liberals. I asked him a question. I quote from pages 15582 to 15591 of *Hansard*. I said: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to hear from the Liberal member from the area just exactly what the Liberal position is on environmental assessment. The member is aware that there has been no environmental assessment and review done on the bridge proposal contained in Bill C-110,"—the bill that is before us—"that the generic bridge proposal was turned down by the FEARO panel".

The hon. member answered as follows: "I stated the position of the Liberal Party very clearly and straightforwardly. We support this project. We want this project to go forward. We have supported this project over the years that it has been discussed—but we also want a full environmental assessment of this particular project and this particular bridge".

He did not say that was his personal position, or his leader's position, or Catherine Callbeck's position. He said it was the position of the Liberal Party.

This bill came back before the House last week on June 10, 1993. Beginning on page 20654 of *Hansard* there is a speech by the member for Hillsborough. He ends his remarks with the statement: "Let us proceed with this project. We feel that all of the necessary commitments have been met and it is time to go on and see it through to fruition".

There is no mention whatsoever of a full environmental assessment and review of the project. Let us deal again for a moment with what Madam Justice Barbara Reed ordered.

• (1330)

At some point Canadian taxpayers would like to know that at least the 295 members who occupy seats in this Chamber have some intention of following the law. What we are talking about and what we are doing today is a violation of Canada's Constitution and law. I for one stand in my place and say that means something.

The Liberals want to squeeze and sleaze their way and get a few extra votes out of a few seats in the maritimes. The Tories want to use the fixed link as a banner to wave around the maritimes saying they are going to do something big for all the voters out there. They are going to spend $1.47 billion building a bridge that has never been assessed.

They do not want to talk about that. They want to pretend that everything is above board. It is not. This Chamber is well on the road to acting in contempt of court. It bothers me and I think it should bother the Canadian public that this place has become so entirely out of touch that the law does not seem to matter.

It is like the person who has just become Canada's Prime Minister, the hon. member for Vancouver Centre. She said before her campaign began that she had smoked marijuana. When asked during the leadership campaign she said she had smoked marijuana but she did not break any law by doing it. Every dean of law in the country said

that was not true. If one smoked marijuana, one broke the law.

Five hundred and thirty thousand Canadians have a criminal record for smoking marijuana. They are all supposed to keep their criminal records. They cannot get bonded jobs. They cannot do anything but it is okay. A person can be the Prime Minister of Canada and break the law. Also, you can say that because you are who you are you did not break the law.

Canadians are getting really sick of this stuff. I am getting really sick of it. There is one law for the grand elevated elite who sit on the government side as prime minister or whatever. The law applies only to the great unwashed. It applies to those Canadians who have to pay the taxes and the piper.

Here is a chance for Parliament itself to do it right. This project from New Brunswick to Prince Edward Island has never been assessed. It is the law in Canada. The Liberals say they will attach some conditions. This is the same bunch of environmental thugs, SCI, who were involved from start to finish in the Oldman River dam in Alberta.

Twenty-four conditions were attached following the order of the highest court in Canada that there be an assessment. Has the SCI, the Minister of Transport or the Minister of the Environment ever lived up to one of those requirements? The number one recommendation was to tear down the dam. That is what the panel found.

It was neither environmentally nor economically sound. However the government said we have to go ahead. SCI, a foreign-owned corporation, is our friend. What about the other 23 recommendations? Will the Minister of Transport at least live up to one of them? He has had more than a year to live up to the other 23 and has not lived up to a single one. That is contempt of court and contempt of Parliament.

Does Parliament do anything? No. When are these people going to be put behind bars? Are we just going to carry on and become like the United States? The level of trust among American citizens for their own institutions is borne out by the number who vote. Less than one in two adults in the United States even bothers to turn out to vote because there is so much corruption in the legislatures in that country. It is fast dropping in this country. Canadians out there are sick to death of this kind of blatant obfuscation and contempt of Parliament, the laws of this country and the environment.

People ask why the cod stocks in Atlantic Canada have collapsed. I will tell you why. I have been here for 15 years. I have listened to Liberal and Conservative ministers of fisheries saying that the fisheries scientists do not know diddley squat. We are going to double and triple the catch. We are going to give more to Cuba, Spain and the Russians.

Now there is no more cod. We are giving hundreds of millions of dollars in welfare to Newfoundlanders who do not want welfare. They were proud and for centuries they went out and fished. However in order to be kind to National Sea and their friends in the corporate sector the Liberal and Conservative ministers of fisheries encouraged, legislated and regulated overfishing.

• (1335)

What about the lobster and the fishery in Northumberland Strait? Professional scientists have said this project is crazy. Young lobster fry float on the surface in Northumberland Strait. If the ice is late moving out because it is blocked by the piers of the bridge, the lobster fry will die or fewer numbers will survive. There will be ice scour on the ocean floor as a result of the piers on the bridge. Why were these four ice scientist experts brought in by the Minister of Public Works not put on to muddy up the refusal?

The environmental assessment and review panel said no to this bridge and yet Parliament is about to vote $1.47 billion, plus a right to tollgate. No one in the Maritimes has been told how much these tolls are going to be. Will it be $10 per person, $50 per person, $100 per car or $500 per truck? This is a right to blood suck for 35 years on the economy of the Maritimes of this country and I will not stand for it. At least I can tell the truth in here. It might not mean a damn but I am telling the people of Canada that what is being done here today is a contempt of Parliament and the laws of this country. It may well be found to be both illegal and unconstitutional in the days to come. That is what a committee of this House found about Alcan's Kemano project in my riding.

The only project in the history of Canada to be exempted from environmental assessment is Alcan's Kemano II project. It was found illegal and unconstitutional by this Parliament. Has this government withdrawn its licence? No, and there is corruption at the very highest levels as well as pay offs and kickbacks but it does not seem to mean anything. There will not be a jot or a tittle on the radio or TV tonight about what is going on. This place hides behind a veil of secrecy as these kinds of deals are cut. The odour arising from this fixed link legislation is worse than methane, a greenhouse gas that I know we fear.

Let us take a look at what the Liberals are proposing here. The Liberals said they stood for a full environmental assessment review in February in this House and they have thrown that to the wind. We heard from the Liberals this morning that one of the principal reasons is that this bridge joins their leader's constituency with Prince Edward Island. How sweet and dear, while I am chastised in this House by Liberal members from the Maritimes who say I am from far away and only come to the Maritimes once in a while so I have no right to speak out against the project.

That is not how this place works. We are supposed to work collectively to try to do the best for the country and make sure that what is done is in the constitutional and legal framework that is best for the country. My Liberal friend's amendment is too little too late. It does not mean a damn and should be voted down for those reasons.

Mr. Bob Corbett (Fundy—Royal): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to what the member for Skeena has had to say in this House as well as the previous speaker.

I concur that the member has every right to speak out against any issue he chooses to. But I think it is terribly important that the member accept his responsibilities to fairly and accurately put before this House and the people of the nation what has gone on with reference to the proposals that are leading up to the development of this link. For a long time it has been shoved aside by this Parliament which has been dominated by others from other regions for whatever reasons but very few reasons have been environment concerns.

A tremendous amount of work has gone into the environmental review process with reference to the project. The developers were called upon at the very beginning to submit an environmental impact study and this was done. That report was made public by the Department of Public Works and the public was asked for input into the entire issue. This document was finally scrutinized by a lot of people, including an independent committee of ice experts.

• (1340)

I think it is important that the people in this House as well as those who are concerned about this issue are aware that expert advice was received from numerous government agencies and departments, including the Department of Fisheries and Oceans and the Department of the Environment.

When it comes to environmental issues I want to remind the hon. member that this government has done more with reference to environmental protection of those sensitive areas of our country than any previous government in the history of the nation.

Witness the green plan, for example. What sorts of proposals have we heard from the NDP except scrap this, scrap that and do nothing? When we talk about putting the country back to work it says we have to do an environmental assessment review and hang the jobs, even when it comes down clearly on the side of the environment. Forget all about it and let the region drift off into the ocean.

It is time to get on with this project. This is a good solid project. Fishermen themselves who have every right to be concerned will be invited to sit on the board which will manage a $10 million trust fund that will be set up by the developer of the project.

We have studied this project from the beginning and now it is time to end it and get on with it. All the conclusions that have been developed and supported by the provincial governments of New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island say to move ahead and get on with it. If we want to stand up and fairly criticize the project, that is good enough. Let us live up to our responsibilities as members of Parliament and do that but make sure we deal with all the facts.

There are concerns about this project and rightly so. Those concerns have been fairly scrutinized and now it is time to get on with it. I say this government's record speaks for itself when it comes to environmental issues. It would not allow a project to move ahead if it felt there

was not good cause for concerns about environmental sensitivity to be set aside.

Mr. Raymond Skelly (North Island—Powell River): Mr. Speaker, I could not resist getting up on the heels of the statement by the previous member for Fundy—Royal in New Brunswick.

It is an amazing distortion of reality, whether we are dealing with the Oldman dam project, the Rafferty-Alameda or Kemano II. I would like to speak to Kemano II in British Columbia as a comparison when he says this government has done incredible works with the environmental issues and it would not consider creating damage in an area of environmental sensitivity. I wish he was going to stay here because his information is so incorrect.

The Kemano II completion project has lowered the flow of the Nechako River to 14 per cent of its original level and damaged the salmon stocks in that river; salmon stocks that would go on forever. This was not done through an environmental assessment or review process. This was done by the hon. member from Richmond when he was Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. He simply went behind closed doors with a proponent and signed off approval for this disgusting project that has cut the level of the Fraser River by three feet at Hell's Gate. This has created enormous damage to one of the strongest producers of salmon in the world.

It is one of the most destructive things that has been done environmentally by any government and it happens to have been done by the Conservative government. There should be no more of this absolute rubbish of standing up and saying the green plan and our environmental record stand for anything over there.

The Conservative government has probably the worst record in Canada in terms of environmental abuse and that is really saying something when we consider what has been done in the past by the Liberal Party.

The hon. member who has put the present amendment forward, as my colleague from Skeena characterizes it, supports too little, too late. It is kind of interesting. She justifies this project. One of its main reasons to recommend it is that the tail of the bridge is in the riding of her leader, the member for Beauséjour. He is the former member from Quebec who did not have the guts to run in his own home province. He had to run in one of the strongest Liberal ridings in New Brunswick to guarantee that he might get back into this House of Commons. This is her rationale for why this bridge should be built.

• (1345)

She did go into many of the problems that brought this project before the courts such as the improper process that was used to assess it and review it environmentally. Again my colleague from Fundy—Royal says that there has been an enormous and tremendous evaluation. Certainly the courts have not adjudicated that way. Again my friend from Skeena characterizes this kind of behaviour where the House of Commons is now considering a government bill to approve it even though it has not gone through a process that is acceptable to the court in following the laws of Canada and following the Constitution.

It is ironic the rubbish that has been placed before this House by the Liberal speaker who has proposed this amendment. She says that the reason we should vote for this as members of the House is because the bridge goes into her leader's riding in Beauséjour. This is absolute rubbish.

There are a couple of other points that are important. The previous speaker from Fundy—Royal says this will be a tremendous boost for the economy of Prince Edward Island. There is absolutely no evidence of that. The clear evidence is that if they remove the ferry then 600 jobs are going to be lost. They talk about 1,000 mythological jobs that may or may not arise on the Island but on the other side of the coin there have been as many good arguments that in fact business will go off the Island and there will be a job loss associated with it. The economic studies are inconclusive at best and certainly point to some concrete job losses as certainties. Those are the 600 jobs associated with the ferries.

My colleague from Skeena brought forward the issue of the toll provisions in the bill. We know what user-pay means to a Conservative. It is gouge and gouge again. There is the constitutional provision of providing a ferry and of assisting the province of Prince Edward Island because of the Island location and the terms of union. Certainly the user-pay approach is going to cost that province dearly. If the example pertains to where they

have used the approach of fee for service in other areas of the economy, it is going to be very harmful.

It is interesting when one goes through Prince Edward Island to see the GST impact on the economy of that province. It has really devastated it. Tourism is way down. Unemployment is way up and the economy basically because of the Tory GST is way down. Wait until every single thing that is brought to Prince Edward Island to be sold or every tourist going there has an additional $10 or $20 toll across a toll bridge. This is going to have another negative, regressive and harmful effect on Prince Edward Island.

All things considered I think that my colleague from Skeena has done an admirable job in summarizing the real complaints that we have with the amendment before the House and indeed the bill that has been proposed by the government. He points out that in his opinion and in the opinion of many others, that bill is illegal.

We should not be dealing with this legislation until the concerns of the courts are met, until the environmental review and assessment process has been completed to the satisfaction and requirements of the law of this country so that we do not wind up back in the courts again.

The hon. member for Skeena points out that the Constitution and laws of Canada have been violated. I do not think this House can countenance that kind of thing and certainly we will be voting against this bill.

They speak of this as being an environmental disaster with the complicated environment around a 13-kilometre bridge. There will be enormous winds in the winter and scouring ice. There are definitely going to be major engineering problems with it.

There is the environmental problem of the effect on the fishery in the Northumberland Strait area. This is again something that is wide open and could easily be damaged. He talks about a $10 million environmental trust fund. My colleague from Skeena was speaking the other day on the oil pollution funds that were put forward by governments to protect against oil spills. It has been completely pillaged by the government in its scouring of funds put there for the purpose of protecting Canadians against oil spills and providing them with some financial assistance for the clean up. The government has stolen those moneys from that fund. It will undoubtedly steal moneys from this pittance that is put into the environmental fund in Prince Edward Island.

• (1350)

We are looking at guaranteed job losses. Some 600 jobs associated with the ferry service are gone. There is the promise of a mythical 1,000 jobs that may be created. Believe me, if it is like any other Conservative promise then there are not going to be 1,000 jobs for those people in P.E.I. who are looking for this.

Again we have the other problem of the harsh government policies that the Conservative government has already inflicted on Newfoundland, not the least of which is the GST. They complain bitterly in that province that it has harmed tourism; that GST at 7 per cent cleans out the entire economy and is going to be coupled with who knows what. Will it be a $10 toll or a $20 toll to drive a car across or to drive freight across, so that anything going in or out of that province is going to be taxed again?

The economic benefits that are preached by this government are certainly serious problems.

An hon. member: Time, time.

Mr. Skelly (North Island—Powell River): Time? We have just started. There is just a minute left, Mr. Speaker? Okay, we will get to the salient points.

My colleagues and I have heard many, many arguments made in this House that were cogent and intelligent. However, there is the argument by the proponent of this particular motion to vote for this bill because its origin starts in the riding of her leader, the member for Beauséjour, who does not have enough guts to go back and run in his own native province because he will not be re-elected.

Mr. David Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I want to begin my remarks by saying to my friends in the New Democratic Party that unfortunately I will not be here tomorrow to participate in third reading debate as there has been a death in my family. In the few minutes that I have I want to put some statements on the record.

I know of the disdain that the New Democratic Party has for those of us who live in Atlantic Canada.

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I want to say that the point the member just made is absolutely and totally false.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): That is not a point of order.

Mr. David Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond): As I was saying, the disdain that my colleagues from the New Democratic Party have for those who reside in Atlantic Canada is best shown not by remarks that I may make but by those made by members from their own particular party. In fact, they made the unbelievable statement in this Chamber not long ago that no one has given an assessment of the fixed link. That was the intellectual snobbery of the New Democratic Party as evidenced in this House.

I know the member for Skeena is going off to another job and another vocation and I wish him well but for God's sake he should not misrepresent the decisions that people in Atlantic Canada have made with regard to their future, whether they are in economic or environmental terms. I want you to know, Mr. Speaker, that consultations took place in November and December 1987. I am going to table this. In January 1988, 12 public debates were held on Prince Edward Island by the province. In January 1988 the Prince Edward Island government held a plebiscite. If there is not an assessment done what better example can I give to my hon. friend from the New Democratic Party than that the people of Prince Edward Island have decided in a plebiscite that they want the fixed link? What intellectual snobbery from the hon. member for Skeena to suggest otherwise.

• (1355)

As we can see, this particular subject matter is of passing interest to those of us who come from the great province of Nova Scotia. However, to stand in this House and to allow the perception to go on that nothing has been done to look at the environmental assessment of this particular project is not only false but it is a distortion of the facts and it is unbecoming of the hon. member who sits to my left.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Fulton: A point of order.

Mr. Dingwall: Mr. Speaker, am I going to be continually interrupted by this individual who had his opportunity to speak—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I have to go ahead and listen to his point of order and I will rule on it.

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Just for the public record the environmental assessment and review turned the generic bridge proposal down.

Mr. Dingwall: I think I have hit a raw nerve.

An hon. member: It is the truth.

Mr. Dingwall: The hon. member would not know how to spell truth let alone talk about truth. This is the same party that comes to this House day in and day out talking about the opportunities that we in Atlantic Canada must have in order to survive and prosper. With the first economic project that comes along what does the New Democratic Party do? It does a filibuster not only in this House but it writes to Canadians across this country in order to preclude this project from taking place.

I want you, Mr. Speaker, to note these dates: December 1987, January 1988, June 1989, March 1990, April 1991, January 1993, April 1993 and May 1993. Those are the public consultations which I will table on the completion of my speech. This is the same party that stands in its place and says that no environmental assessments have been done on the marine aspect and on the fisheries. There have been not 1, 2, 3, 10 or 20 but 24 different studies done. I will table those for the benefit of members opposite and members in this House.

This is the same hon. member and the same party standing in place saying that no environmental assessment has been done with regard to ice. There have been not 2, 5, 10 or 15 but 17 different studies done on ice. I table that for the hon. member opposite.

There is the wind and tide. Something that the hon. member is very familiar with is wind. Have there been any studies done with regard to wind? There have been not one or two but four comprehensive studies done with regard to wind.

What about the social and economic benefits of this particular project? Have there been any studies done by the Government of Canada, the Government of New Brunswick and the Government of Prince Edward Island? If we listen to the hon. member down in the left corner, where his group will remain for centuries to come, there has been not one or two but nine different socioeconomic studies done with regard to this particular

project. I table that for the hon. member to reflect upon during the next 24 hours.

What about miscellaneous reports done by such distinguished groups as the Atlantic Provinces Economic Council, the Atlantic Geoscience Centre, Coles Associates Limited, Environment Canada and Geo-Consulting Engineers? There were not 1, 2, 3, 10 or 20 but 23 different studies done with regard to this particular project. I table that for the hon. member in the left-hand corner of this House who will remain there for an indefinite period of time.

What about the FEARO and related reports? Four studies have been done with regard to that. I am a member who is not like those intellectual snobs in the New Democratic Party. There have been 10 terrestrial studies done. There have been four reports done on the list of strait crossings and there are related reports. Therefore I table all of these reports, both consultations and substantive reports, for the hon. members opposite as well as those in the New Democratic Party so that they can reflect on them.

Hon. members must understand why I will not be here tomorrow, but in the final moment I have now I would like to say that the height of hypocrisy and the height of disdain for those of us who live in Atlantic Canada comes from that group in the corner of this House that is trying to dictate to the people of Atlantic Canada what is important about their futures.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): It being two o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 30(5), the House will now proceed to statements by members pursuant to Standing Order 31.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 31

[*Translation*]

HON. JEAN CHAREST

Mr. Guy Saint-Julien (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to congratulate the Hon. Kim Campbell for winning the leadership of the Progressive Conservative Party.

I also want to pay special tribute to the hon. member for Sherbrooke for the excellent way in which he conducted his campaign.

The competence and performance of our candidate has increasingly impressed Canadians. Many people attribute this to his relaxed attitude, his comprehensive grasp of current issues and his clear vision of the future. After yesterday, we can also admire his courage, frankness and diplomacy.

Today is another day for this admirable member of Parliament and together we will develop strategies for change within the Conservative Party.

We were and we still are proud to support our candidate. Thank you Jean, thank you Michèle, thank you to the volunteers in the Charest team across Canada and in Quebec, and thank you to the people of the riding of Sherbrooke. See you soon.

* * *

[*English*]

HON. KIM CAMPBELL

Mr. Fred J. Mifflin (Bonavista—Trinity—Conception): Madam Speaker, I rise to congratulate the newly elected Conservative leader who will be sworn in as Prime Minister in a few days.

The party leadership convention is over but a far harder test faces the new leader: the challenge of running the country. The new Tory leader is on record as being 100 per cent committed to continue the policies of the Minister for International Trade, including the GST, the FTA, the NAFTA and 38 tax increases.

She sat and agreed in cabinet while the government played demolition derby with Atlantic Canada. It closed down the fishery, closed down the transportation system, closed down post offices and drastically reduced provincial transfer payments to cause reductions in health services and increases in tuition fees.

The biggest questions now are: How will the Conservatives recast themselves after nine disastrous years in office and how will Canada be positioned for economic growth and job creation?

There is plenty of scope for quick action by a new Prime Minister, but since there is no mandate the clear priority is first and foremost to call a federal election and allow Canadians to pass judgment.

* * *

CONSERVATIVE PARTY

Mr. Stan Wilbee (Delta): Madam Speaker, as chairman of the B.C. caucus I am delighted to congratulate the soon to be 19th Prime Minister of Canada.

Not only is Kim Campbell the first woman to hold that position, but she is also the first person born in British Columbia to hold the highest elected office in the country. I am sure all British Columbians and all Canadians will wish her well in her new office. We know that all of Canada will benefit and prosper under her leadership.

At the same time I would like to congratulate all the other candidates for their outstanding contributions to the campaign and, more important, to Canada.

I would particularly like to express my appreciation to the hon. Jean Charest for his excellent campaign. I am looking forward to the major contributions that he will no doubt make in Canada's future. A great future for Canada is assured with quality people like those who participated in our leadership race these past few months.

* * *

CONSERVATIVE PARTY

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West): Madam Speaker, while the Conservative Party will now be led by new Tories for Canadians across the country, especially in Ontario, it really is the same old story.

There was the new leader flanked by the trade minister. Imagine embracing the father of the GST, the FTA, NAFTA, an economic agenda that has cost so much economic pain and betrayal. So much for her so-called new politics.

Imagine embracing the member for Don Valley North, the mother of the Tory solution for combating poverty whose answers lie in reducing the poverty line and damning the food banks. So much for her politics of inclusion.

Imagine embracing the outgoing Prime Minister, a man who was the star of the Tory convention yet is despised by Canadians across the country. So much for her being in touch with the aspirations of ordinary Canadians.

No, the Tories did not turn the page. The chapter in this unfortunate saga continues.

• (1405)

They had an option yesterday. They could have said no to their old ways. However in rejecting a new course they merely confirmed that the new Tory is really an old Tory, which is nothing but the same old story.

* * *

CONSERVATIVE PARTY

Mr. Bob Corbett (Fundy—Royal): Madam Speaker, I would like to congratulate the hon. Minister of National Defence, Canada's soon to be 19th Prime Minister, for her historic victory this weekend.

My colleagues who let their names stand in the leadership race also deserve credit, particularly the hon. Minister of the Environment whose own campaign sparked enthusiasm and interest and generated tremendous excitement in the selection of Canada's 19th Prime Minister and the new leader of our party.

It is a great moment in both Canadian political and national life. Rest assured that today the PC Party stands strong and united and is prepared to move into the future and win the next election.

* * *

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Cid Samson (Timmins—Chapleau): Madam Speaker, like all members in the House I would like to offer my congratulations to the newly elected leader of the Conservative Party and the soon to be Prime Minister.

I would like to remind the House that when Bill C-113 was being introduced we predicted that it would affect women the most. Metro Toronto figures are now bearing this out.

In the month of May there was a rise of 4.3 per cent in the number of employable single females requiring UI compared to a .4 per cent increase in the number of employable single males requiring assistance. There was also an increase of 3.5 per cent in the number of female family heads requiring welfare.

As many witnesses testified during hearings on Bill C-113, women are far more likely to be forced into quitting their jobs because of harassment, child care or the need to follow a spouse.

The so-called just reasons are often not accepted by the commission—

Madam Deputy Speaker: The member's time has expired.

* * *

CONSERVATIVE PARTY

Mrs. Louise Feltham (Wild Rose): Madam Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to rise in the House today to congratulate my colleague, the hon. Kim Campbell, on her historic leadership victory yesterday.

We in the Progressive Conservative Party are very fortunate to have had such a strong field of candidates to choose from. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate my colleagues, the hon. Jean Charest, Jim Edwards, Patrick Boyer and Garth Turner. The quality of their campaigns, which focused on policy and serious issues, and their dedication to the party and to Canada deserve special mention.

However the highest congratulations must go to Kim Campbell who has shown that she has support in every part of this country and from every walk of life. All of us on this side of the House support Kim. We are confident that she will lead us to a third consecutive majority government.

* * *

[*Translation*]

MONTREAL ECONOMY

Mr. Alfonso Gagliano (Saint-Léonard): Madam Speaker, yesterday the Conservative Party elected a new leader. Congratulations.

Will Quebec be better represented by this new leader? The answer obviously is no. The hon. member for Vancouver Centre has supported the GST, a monetary policy that was absurd, free trade and all the other policies as a result of which today Montreal is the poverty capital of Canada.

Thanks to these policies, which were defended by the minister of defence, more than 220,000 people in Montreal are unemployed and more than 22 per cent are living below the poverty line. More than 20 tons of food are distributed daily in the metropolitan area.

Even with a new leader, Quebecers and Canadians will massively reject the Conservative Party which is reponsible for this disaster. What Canada needs is an election and a new government.

* * *

[*English*]

HON. KIM CAMPBELL

Ms. Barbara Greene (Don Valley North): Madam Speaker, on Sunday, June 13 Progressive Conservatives chose the hon. Kim Campbell as our next national leader.

In this race there were no losers. Runner-up Jean Charest has dramatically increased his stature, as have Jim Edwards and Garth Turner. Our national party has also gained as all Conservatives are united behind the first woman Prime Minister of Canada and the first Prime Minister born in British Columbia.

Kim Campbell won this leadership because she is competent, highly qualified, decisive and an excellent communicator. There is tremendous significance in this decision for all women in Canada. It means that any person in this country can aspire to the highest political office in this land.

Our challenge now will be to win the trust and confidence of all Canadians as we pursue our agenda: a confident, competitive country that offers the highest of opportunities and quality of life to all its diverse people. Congratulations, Kim.

* * *

• (1410)

HON. KIM CAMPBELL

Mr. David Walker (Winnipeg North Centre): Madam Speaker, I rise in the House today to congratulate the member for Vancouver Centre on being selected as her party's new leader and Canada's first woman Prime Minister.

Westerners are particularly interested in this new leader. We will be watching with interest to see how she turns around Tory policies that have ignored the collapse of our grain industry, refused to respond to the needs of our large aboriginal population, refused to deal with the crises in our air and rail industries, refused to aid job

creation, refused to deal with the collapse of Senate reform, and most important, refused to deal with the fiscal crisis brought about by the mismanagement of the economy and the federal debt.

While the west welcomes one of its own what it really wants is a new government.

* * *

SOMALIA

Mr. John Brewin (Victoria): Madam Speaker, unfortunately this weekend UN forces in Somalia reportedly fired into a demonstration, killing 20 Somalis. Among those killed were a 12-year old and a 2-year old child.

Relief officials in the area are worried about the impact of this incident on the fundamental role of the United Nations. Jaimie McGoldrick, deputy field director for Save the Children Fund in Britain, said:

> These are not tactics to rebuild. These are tactics to destroy. Unless the United Nations gets its act together, it's lost all credibility.

We in Canada know of some of the problems there and in the relationship between the peacekeepers and the people of Somalia. Given the long-term objective we would call on the government to take a look at the Standing Committee on National Defence and Veterans Affairs report tabled last week in the House and consider the recommendations that it publish its views on the future role of UN peacekeeping.

* * *

[*Translation*]

THE LATE GÉRARD CÔTÉ

Mr. Charles A. Langlois (Manicouagan): Madam Speaker, today the international sports world in Canada and Quebec is in mourning. A four time winner in Boston, Gérard Côté went through the finish line at his last marathon this weekend. In Saint-Hyacinthe, as we walk along the avenue that bears his name, we remember his ready smile, his solid determination and his extraordinary generosity.

Madam Speaker, I am sure all members of this House will join you, since he was a personal friend of yours, in extending to his wife Lucille and members of his family our sincere condolences and the assurance that we will always remember him.

[*English*]

CAMBODIA

Mr. Lee Clark (Brandon—Souris): Madam Speaker, the Cambodian people turned out to vote in incredible numbers in the recent election despite the threats of intimidation and acts of violence to which they were subjected.

Although 10 per cent to 15 per cent of Cambodians were not able to vote due to Khmer Rouge opposition and despite the fact that an estimated 200 deaths occurred during the campaign itself, mostly due to government attacks on opposition party workers, the election results should be accepted as being the will of those voting.

Sadly, however, the Huan Sen government is now refusing to accept its defeat. Faced with renewed threats of violence from government troops and widespread looting, UN civilian personnel are being withdrawn.

The people of Cambodia have suffered almost unthinkably in their past. Their hope now depends on the ability of a new government to implement its policies.

The international community must do whatever it can to ensure that the will of the people is respected. If that is not the case, there will once again be civil war in that much too troubled land.

* * *

[*Translation*]

THE DEFICIT

Mr. Mark Assad (Gatineau—La Lièvre): Madam Speaker, I would like to comment on the deficit. Unfortunately, these days at practically all political levels the deficit is seen as one of the causes of our faltering economy. I feel I must point out that the deficit is not a cause but rather a consequence of misdirected policies. We should deal with the causes instead of treating the deficit as the main problem.

These misdirected policies are economic, financial and fiscal in nature. For instance, government budgets at all levels are financed with the help of foreign loans. Our monetary policies are designed to protect the interests of foreign investors, instead of meeting our domestic needs. Furthermore, there is a total lack of control over all kinds of foreign investment.

* * *

[*English*]

HON. KIM CAMPBELL

Mr. Raymond Skelly (North Island—Powell River): Madam Speaker, we in this caucus also wish to congratulate the new Socred Prime Minister of Canada.

In this political leadership contest the new Socred Prime Minister narrowly defeated the tortoise from Sherbrooke. However in another leadership contest a number of years ago this Socred Prime Minister of Canada was judged by her peers as less competent and less capable than another well-known Socred, Bill Vander Zalm.

The Prime Minister is also the first woman Prime Minister of Canada. However she has failed the women of Canada on the Court Challenges Program, on the choice issue, on the national child care program and on pay equity.

• (1415)

The women of Canada will suffer under this new Prime Minister as will Canadians in general. The fact she is a Socred is more important than the fact she is a woman.

At least we can all be thankful that this new captain of the *Titanic* and this old Tory government will shortly have an appointment with an iceberg.

* * *

BREAST CANCER SOCIETY OF CANADA

Mr. Ken James (Sarnia—Lambton): Madam Speaker, I too would like to congratulate our new Progressive Conservative leader, the Hon. Kim Campbell. I know that she and all members of the House will be interested in my statement today.

I rise today to bring to the attention of all members of the House and indeed all Canadians, the activities and efforts of the Breast Cancer Society of Canada. The goal of the society is to fund research into the prevention, detection, treatment and the cure of breast cancer.

At this time the group needs computers, supplies, equipment and so on. But what the Breast Cancer Society of Canada needs most is the time and dedication of interested volunteers, Canadians from coast to coast, to make this a truly national effort and organization.

If members of the House or Canadians across the country are interested in information on becoming a part of the Breast Cancer Society of Canada they should contact the president, Mr. Lawrence Greenaway, at 401 St. Clair Street, Point Edward, Ontario, N7V 1P2, or call the national headquarters at 1-800-567-8767.

Today I encourage all Canadians to get involved in this worthy cause.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

TRADE

Hon. Roy MacLaren (Etobicoke North): Madam Speaker, on behalf of the Liberal Party and our leader, I would like to offer congratulations to the Minister of National Defence on her election as leader of the Conservative Party.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacLaren: Let me also congratulate her challengers, in particular the Minister of the Environment, for their spirited campaigns.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacLaren: Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister for International Trade. President Clinton has now admitted that the negotiation of side agreements to the NAFTA is "at an impasse". The United States is demanding that tough trade sanctions be included, but so far Canada has opposed any such plan.

Canadians deserve a clear answer to this question. Is it the policy of the government that it will refuse to proclaim NAFTA rather than accept trade sanctions, yes or no?

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Industry, Science and Technology and Minister for International Trade): First, Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his gracious remarks on behalf of his party. I am sure the Minister of National Defence, the Minister of the Environment and the members of caucus who were candidates in the leadership are most appreciative of his remarks. It was a very stimulating and successful weekend. I am sure there are major challenges ahead for all of us and we look forward to those challenges.

Let me respond to the question the hon. member has posed on the matter of sanctions. We have made it very clear that the agreements on the environment and on labour should be subject to some form of mechanism to ensure compliance. We have stated very clearly that we are opposed to trade sanctions. However, we have asked to see whether the negotiators can find some common ground that would satisfy the needs of all parties in order to ensure there is compliance with the agreement.

Hon. Roy MacLaren (Etobicoke North): Madam Speaker, the minister has claimed repeatedly that the NAFTA will not be altered by the side agreements. However, the United States administration is now demanding a third side agreement, an agreement on import surges.

The minister knows that such an agreement would modify the existing provisions of NAFTA which could in turn require amendments to the Canadian legislation which the government recently pressed through the House of Commons.

How can the minister continue to assert that the side agreements will not affect the nature of NAFTA?

• (1420)

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Industry, Science and Technology and Minister for International Trade): I will say it again for the benefit of my hon. friend and others. All three governments are committed to not reopening the NAFTA.

We believe, and it has been said by the United States itself, that sections 701 and 702 of the NAFTA provide very strong protection on import surges. The proposals the United States put forward may enhance the nature of those, but they certainly will not result in the reopening of the agreement itself.

Hon. Roy MacLaren (Etobicoke North): Madam Speaker, the minister knows a prerequisite for Canadians to benefit from any freer trade is to remove the barriers within our own country to the free movement of people, goods, services and capital.

However five years after the U.S.-Canada free trade agreement the British Columbia government has said that provincial regulations concerning regional development and local jobs are non-negotiable.

Is the government prepared to say today that it will move unilaterally on free trade within Canada to meet its own deadline of June 1994?

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Industry, Science and Technology and Minister for International Trade): Madam Speaker, that deadline has been set in consultation with the provinces. As my hon. friend has just pointed out, these are provincial barriers that must be eliminated with the full consultation and co-operation of the provincial governments.

Collectively we have approved a comprehensive negotiating process supported by all the provinces, including British Columbia. It is in that regard we will be commencing negotiations starting July 1.

We expect that even though the number of barriers we have to negotiate is formidable we can, with the proper will and the power to all concerned, meet the deadlines we have set out.

I could not agree more with what my hon. friend has said. It is very important that we have free trade within our borders as we see our boundaries open up with the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement and NAFTA, but also with the Uruguay round that is going to be with us in a very short period of time.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bob Speller (Haldimand—Norfolk): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister for International Trade. We know that the U.S. Congress does not intend to approve NAFTA. Why does the minister refuse to negotiate a binational agreement to protect jobs in the steel industry? Why?

[*English*]

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Industry, Science and Technology and Minister for International Trade): Madam Speaker, the hon. member is well aware of the efforts this government has gone to in order to seek the support of the United States steel industry, the United States unions and the United States administration.

Unfortunately at this point in time they are not willing to discuss this matter. It is something we continue to press with the administration at the government level. We have also asked the companies and the unions at every opportunity they can to propose the same sort of discussion and dialogue with their counterparts.

I am hopeful once we get through the trade remedy actions that are under way we can see some movement in this file.

Mr. Bob Speller (Haldimand—Norfolk): Madam Speaker, the minister must know that literally thousands of jobs in my riding, throughout Ontario, the maritimes, Quebec and the west are dependent on the Canadian steel industry.

He knows he has options. He knows he could make an extraordinary challenge under the GATT. He knows he could replace the chairman of the tribunal.

Why will the minister not act now to save these Canadian jobs and to tell the world that Canada is not a dumping ground for steel?

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Industry, Science and Technology and Minister for International Trade): Madam Speaker, most people in the House would understand that the options my friend has just put forward are not workable options if one would think about them for just one minute.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Hon. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton—Melville): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister.

First, on behalf of my party I extend our congratulations to the Minister of National Defence for winning the leadership of her party and commend the other candidates for their campaigns.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

• (1425)

Mr. Nystrom: The Minister of National Defence said on the weekend that she wants to restore confidence among the Canadian people. If we have to restore confidence, it means that confidence must have been shattered in the past, likely by government policies that have left people in unemployment lines and welfare lines.

Can the Deputy Prime Minister tell us whether or not the government is planning any new directions or new policies to create jobs in Canada or is it just more of the same from the same old government and the same old gang?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance): Madam Speaker, may I say thank you to the hon. member who has expressed best wishes and congratulations on behalf of his party to our new leader and to all the candidates who participated.

The hon. member knows very well that we have gone through a very difficult period, a global recession. Many industrialized countries are deep in a downturn in their economies. As I indicated in the House the other day, the European economies are trying to contract in 1993 and that is the first time in over 30 years.

We have a pretty clear indication that growth is taking hold. We have just seen the composite leading indicator increase by the greatest amount in two years. We have had strong performance in growth in the fourth quarter of 1992. We have had strong performance in growth in the first quarter of 1993.

What is most encouraging is that growth is occurring in the goods-producing sector which is creating jobs, particularly in the manufacturing sector. All of this is given to a large extent by our ability to export more because of improved competitiveness and improved productivity.

The fact that those fundamentals are in place augurs well for the future.

Hon. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton—Melville): Madam Speaker, government policies like the GST, the free trade deal and NAFTA are what have shaken the confidence of Canadians.

Can the Deputy Prime Minister tell unemployed Canadians today whether there will be any changes in these fundamental policies that have shaken the confidence of Canadians, or can we expect the same old policies that have brought this country to its knees?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance): Madam Speaker, the hon. member talks about the GST.

For the last 20 years his party has been advocating the scrapping of the manufacturers' sales tax and replacing it with a broad base sales tax that would not impair our ability to compete abroad, particularly in the manufacturing and processing sector.

The reason we are experiencing growth and job creation in the processing and manufacturing sector is that we have put those industries on a more competitive playing field. Furthermore, the reason we are doing well on the manufacturing and processing side is that we do have a free trade agreement with the United States. We intend to expand that under a broader North American free trade agreement which will provide a greater and more secure access.

The hon. member comes from an agricultural area. He should be interested in knowing that since the free trade agreement came into effect agrifood exports to the United States have increased by 67 per cent. Why would he want to kill a policy that has provided that kind of support for the agricultural industry?

* * *

HEALTH CARE

Hon. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton—Melville): Madam Speaker, it is the same old policies from the same old gang.

The new leader of the party has talked about change. One change she talked about was the possibility of allowing the provinces to charge user fees in medical care. User fees do not work. We know that.

Can the Deputy Prime Minister assure the House today that the change the government has in mind will not allow the province to impose medical care user fees or deterrent fees which would be nothing more than a tax on the sick?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance): Madam Speaker, I think the new leader has made it very clear she intends to work closely with the provinces in dealing with the deficit and the debt situation and in dealing with the number of challenges we face in bolstering economic growth and in achieving social justice.

I can assure my hon. friend that kind of consultation and close co-operation will prevail for the betterment of all Canadians.

* * *

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

Ms. Mary Clancy (Halifax): Madam Speaker, last summer in Nova Scotia the unemployment rate for students was 23.8 per cent. The government has cut the budget of SEED by 44 per cent since 1985 and the total jobs created under SEED has dropped by 40,000 over six years.

• (1430)

The new leader speaks of inclusion. My question is for the Deputy Prime Minister. Why has his government failed to include young people in the Tory agenda?

Hon. Pierre H. Cadieux (Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport) and Minister of State (Youth) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Again, Madam Speaker, as the Deputy Prime Minister says, they were not excluded. They were pretty well included and inclusive at the convention this weekend.

Whenever the opposition refers to the SEED program it isolates the SEED part of the program from the total Challenge program which was redone in 1988 by the then minister in order to deal with the students at risk, the ones who were dropping out of school. The moneys have not been reduced. They have been increased this year alone by $5.1 million.

Ms. Mary Clancy (Halifax): Madam Speaker, talk is cheap. Indeed, some of those fine young people, and they are fine young people, who were at the Tory convention will be back in my office next week still looking for summer jobs.

This government has been promising reforms to the Canada Student Loans Program for two years, but students are still stuck with a 3 per cent tax and the removal of the six-month grace period for repayment. The government speaks of competitiveness and prosperity but does everything possible to hinder such projects.

I ask the minister this: Since this government is clearly doing nothing for students, why not simply call an election and end an illegitimate government?

Hon. Pierre H. Cadieux (Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport) and Minister of State (Youth) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, I would be very surprised if those students who were at the convention end up in the hon. member's office. I am sure that those young students are also looking forward to an election very soon because we will be back in office for a third consecutive majority term and the member will still be sitting there.

Mr. John Harvard (Winnipeg—St. James): Madam Speaker, I also want to pursue this issue of youth unemployment.

Students need jobs to finance their education but they are finding there is no room for them in this Tory economy. In my home province of Manitoba youth unemployment stands at over 16 per cent. There is no evidence of a turn-around and no hope from a tired old government with no mandate from the people.

My question is this: Why has the government failed students in the west, and in particular Manitoba?

Hon. Pierre H. Cadieux (Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport) and Minister of State (Youth) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Again, Madam Speaker, this government is working not only for the students of Canada but all Canadians. One of the best ways to make sure that our young people, particularly students, have a chance in the future is to put all the instruments in place so that they can face the challenges they will be facing all their lives, bearing in mind all the changes that are coming about and bearing in mind the situation they will be faced with in the year 2000.

That is exactly what we are doing, and in particular in Manitoba.

Mr. John Harvard (Winnipeg—St. James): A supplementary, Madam Speaker. A lot of students in my riding are confused over what this government says and does. On the one hand the government talks about the importance of youth employment. On the other hand it has taken millions out of the youth summer employment program. Moreover, universities in Manitoba have suffered serious cutbacks and students have had to pay steep increases in tuition fees.

My question is: Does the government have any plan whatsoever for students or is it just waiting for its own demise?

Hon. Pierre H. Cadieux (Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport) and Minister of State (Youth) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, the weekend demonstrated very clearly that we are far from waiting for our demise. On the contrary, I think the hon. member will feel that those benches are very comfortable when we come back after the election.

The money was not cut back. This year alone the budget was increased by $5.1 million. If the students in my hon. friend's riding are confused, perhaps they spend too much time in his office.

* * *

TRADE

Mr. David D. Stupich (Nanaimo—Cowichan): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister for International Trade.

The announcement of the panel on Friday last about the American import of Canadian live hogs shows, if nothing else, that the Americans are determined not to give open access to Canadian produce but rather to keep fighting every battle until they have won the war.

• (1435)

Does the minister still believe in the dispute settlement mechanism as contrasted to a definition of subsidy?

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Industry, Science and Technology and Minister for International Trade): Madam Speaker, like the hon. members, we are disappointed in the decision that has been handed down by the panel. I should say to my hon. friend that the circumstances in this particular panel were different from previous panels where we were successful.

We as always have tried to work with the industries involved and with the provinces where they have taken an active part in putting our best foot forward. We will continue to do so in any of these situations that get referred to free trade panels.

The simple answer to my hon. friend's question is yes, we have something with the free trade panel system that no other country has today and it has served us very well in this country.

Mr. David D. Stupich (Nanaimo—Cowichan): Madam Speaker, it seems to me the minister mentioned a very crucial difference when he says we lost. That is quite different.

We are dealing with an industry with 30,000 employees. One-fifteenth of our production of hogs has been going to the United States. This is going to be a dramatic blow to the farmers producing those hogs.

Does the minister have in mind any changes that can be made within Canada so that we will not lose our access to that American market? There are three more years being studied. At $18 million a year out of sales of $175 million, three times more, that is another $54 million; $72 million in total. The farmers cannot stand that.

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Industry, Science and Technology and Minister for International Trade): Madam Speaker, let me point something out to my hon. friend before he throws all sorts of doom and gloom on this whole picture.

Canada has won five of the panel decisions on agrifood issues. In that regard I think my hon. friend would rightly agree with me that the panel system has served the agricultural sector extremely well in this country.

My hon. friend has asked whether there are some changes that should be made. If he has some proposals to make in that regard, we would be very happy to listen to them, but they obviously have to be consistent with international trade rules.

* * *

FISHERIES

Hon. Roger C. Simmons (Burin—St. George's): Madam Speaker, I have a question for my friend, the minister of fisheries.

His fisheries adjustment measures in the gulf have to be a real cruel hoax. The plan does not come anywhere near what is needed there. The criteria are quite unreasonable and discriminatory. Thousands of fishermen and plant workers will not qualify for the compensation. To add insult to injury, because of the bungling of the minister and his department nobody even seems to know who qualifies for these measures.

I want to ask the minister: Will he now agree to review the program so it can be delivered quickly and a little more fairly than is the indication right now?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency): Madam Speaker, this is a program of assistance in areas outside the northern cod area where the situation is quite complicated, where there is no moratorium on the fishery, where the allowable catch levels have had to be reduced because of the state of the stocks, where there is a mixed fishery, where for the most part fishermen do not fish just for groundfish but other species as well.

We are attempting to assist those who are dependent primarily on groundfish. The criteria are not that complicated. The fisherman who got 50 per cent of his landings of fish last year from groundfish stocks is eligible for assistance. We think about 2,000 fishermen will qualify for the assistance. That is about 5 per cent of the 44,000 active inshore fishermen in Atlantic Canada. There are a great many others receiving the northern cod assistance. There will be 5,000 to 5,500 plant workers who are working in plants that receive at least 25 per cent of their throughput in groundfish.

In addition we are reviewing the situation to see if more needs to be done. There is never enough time for fishermen or fisheries. We are reviewing the program to see if any more needs to be done or what more can be done to assist in this complicated situation.

Never in the history of Canada have such large programs of assistance been put in place for the fishermen of Atlantic Canada.

• (1440)

Hon. Roger C. Simmons (Burin—St. George's): Madam Speaker, the minister should talk to his department. He in his own mind may know who qualifies. He may know what the criteria are, but why does he not go and ask his department why it does not have the paperwork done on this? The department is still fumbling around as to what the procedure ought to be.

Tonight at Port-aux-Basques there are going to be community leaders, fishermen and plant workers by the hundreds on the southwest coast of Newfoundland demonstrating against this latest bungled effort of the minister. They are doing so because they have been

victimized by the quota cuts and by the unfairness of the program that the minister has just been talking about. They know that in the end most of them are going to be denied funding assistance under this latest program.

I want to ask the minister when he is going to finally answer their cry. All they are asking for is some help. His latest promise was that he would have this program in place by May 15. Tomorrow is June 15. When is he going to get moving on this one?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency): Madam Speaker, you will realize that the the hon. member's comments are grossly exaggerated.

Yes, there will doubtless be a demonstration in Port-aux-Basques and there will be demonstrations all over Atlantic Canada as the demonstrators say that the assistance they are getting is inadequate. It was ever thus. If we double the assistance there will be demonstrations saying that the double assistance is not enough. If we quadruple or quintuple it there will be demonstrations to say that the assistance is not enough.

Why does the hon. gentleman not make some constructive suggestion? Why does he not suggest to the provincial Government of Newfoundland and Labrador that it do something to assist. There is no law that stops the provincial governments of Atlantic Canada from assisting. Why do they not supplement our assistance? Why do they not do something about the fish processing industry? Why does the hon. gentleman not turn his attention to the Liberal Government of Newfoundland for failing the people of Newfoundland abysmally?

* * *

TRADE

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Madam Speaker, that is a real rant.

My question is for the Minister for International Trade. Last week the government struck out again in its relations with the United States when the United States imposed a countervail duty of $20 per hog for the 1989-90 year. This is going to cost the Canadian pork producers some $14 million dollars over and above the $4 million which they have already paid.

I want to ask the minister: Is this not simply another failure of the free trade deal? What is the government going to do to stop this constant harassing of Canadian pork producers which has been going on since 1985? What is the minister going to do?

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Industry, Science and Technology and Minister for International Trade): Madam Speaker, my hon. friend delights in talking about failures. Let us talk about the successes. Let us talk about the fact that agrifood exports are 67 per cent higher under the free trade agreement than was the case before 1989.

Let us talk about the export value of beef cuts being up 127 per cent under the free trade agreement. Let us also talk about the five panel decisions that came down in favour of Canada in the agrifood sector.

These are the things that my hon. friend will never talk about because he does not like success.

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Madam Speaker, my supplementary question is for the Minister of Agriculture.

Now that the binational panel has ruled that the tripartite stabilization program is illegal and subject to a countervail duty by United States law—and of course this is only one, it covers beef and many other commodities as well—I want to ask the minister if he is planning to take any action to make sure that stabilization programs by the government are not going to be constantly harassed by the United States as they have been with pork since 1985.

Hon. Charles Mayer (Minister of Agriculture): Madam Speaker, we have had some problems with the Americans on national tripartite, but to point out again, we won two panels on live hogs and pork that saw I think over $20 million of refunds to Canadian producers.

I should tell the member that the department has been doing some work with various provinces. We hope that at the federal-provincial meeting coming up in the early part of July we can make some pretty good progress in getting additional commodities to be part of the NISA process as a way of supporting.

• (1445)

The prospects for both beef and horticulture are good. The hon. member will know what I am talking about because he has been very involved in this. We appreciate his involvement. Hopefully if we can make the progress we think we can, it will be a much better program for producers. Certainly it will be more in compliance with the international trade rules.

We are making some progress in the area about which he is showing some concern.

* * *

SMALL BUSINESS

Mrs. Louise Feltham (Wild Rose): Madam Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of State for Small Businesses and Tourism.

We recognize that small business is the greatest creator of new jobs and that many small businesses have expressed concerns about the availability of funds under the Small Businesses Loans Act.

My question for the minister is this. What assurances has he received from Canadian banks that they will promote the Small Businesses Loans Act and help small business to obtain the financing it needs to create jobs?

Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister for Science and Minister of State (Small Businesses and Tourism)): Madam Speaker, what a fine question that is.

It is relevant because she knows that 85 per cent of all new jobs created in Canada have been created by small business. It is the engine of the economy.

I want to tell her what happened last week. I met with the banks to ask them what they were doing to promote the Small Businesses Loans Act. They indicate that all their branches are fully trained now. They have their brochures out. The Government of Canada will have a stuffer in its national revenue mailings.

More important than that, in April registrations under the act were up 47 per cent over the previous year. In May they were up 88 per cent over the previous year. The banks now predict they are going to do over $1 billion more business under the SBLA this year than they did last year.

This program is working extremely well. It is a strategic and effective way to stimulate the economy through the small business sector.

* * *

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Steve Butland (Sault Ste. Marie): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Employment and Immigration. It concerns the subject of UI appeals.

I have an example of many thousands across the country. A group of workers at a local paper mill in my constituency won an appeal at the board of referees recently. The government has decided to appeal this positive decision, thus suspending the benefits for the workers.

We are not surprised with the actions of the government but we are surprised that the appeal at the umpire will be held in two to three years. Was the minister aware of the delays? If so, does he accept them? If not, what is he going to do to clear up the backlog?

Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Madam Speaker, the hon. member refers to a government decision.

We had a very long meeting to decide whether or not to appeal it. The hon. member is trying to picture this as something out of the usual course of administration of the UI act.

The question of delays will be addressed because contrary to what members argued when we tried to reform the UI act a few years ago and most recently in Bill C-113, the number of cases being appealed is not actually increasing as was predicted would happen. The early numbers indicate a drop in appeals. That should result in fewer delays for appeals.

Mr. Steve Butland (Sault Ste. Marie): Madam Speaker, I have a supplementary question.

I am glad the minister paid particular attention to this appeal. He is likely aware there are 4,358 cases waiting to be heard across Canada at the umpire level. Earlier this year the minister stated: "The vast majority of cases are being dealt with expeditiously and within a reasonable length of time".

We had a labour dispute at Algoma Steel in 1990 and the appeal may be heard in October 1993. How can the minister possibly defend a backlog of three years and 4,358 cases?

Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Madam Speaker, Canadians should know that a little over 3,000 cases—

Some hon. members: Four thousand cases.

Mr. Valcourt: —are part of 3.5 million decisions that are being made and handled by the department.

I am not saying that the question of delay is not important. We are concerned about Canadians getting quicker service. The department is trying to see how we can improve the situation so Canadians get access to the benefits they are entitled to with the least possible delay.

* * *

• (1450)

AIRLINE INDUSTRY

Mr. John Manley (Ottawa South): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport.

Two weeks ago in a speech to the National Airline Commission in Washington the president of Air Canada called on the government to end the destructive competition that is harming the airline industry in Canada by introducing price regulation.

Incredibly last week in this House the Minister of Transport replied by saying essentially that the government's policies are working. Is the minister telling Canadians it is government policy to allow two large carriers to continue a process of destructive competition, causing loss of jobs and leading ultimately to the collapse of one or both major national airline carriers in this country? Is that government policy?

Hon. Jean Corbeil (Minister of Transport): Madam Speaker, I would ask the hon. member this question. Does his party want to completely abolish competition in this country? In other words, is he on the side of the air carriers or is he on the side of the passengers?

Mr. John Manley (Ottawa South): Madam Speaker, we have heard ridiculous answers before but that one takes the cake.

If there is going to be a monopoly, there will not be competition. The minister knows that. What we are talking about is the survival of a competitive Canadian-controlled airline industry.

The minister and the government have a few days left to make an important decision on this issue. Are they going to do so? Are they going to announce it? Do they favour a competitive Canadian-controlled airline industry? If so, what are they going to do to see that occurs?

Hon. Jean Corbeil (Minister of Transport): Madam Speaker, in its recent report, the NTA indicated that it has examined whether the proposed transaction is in the public interest. It has concluded that it is in the interest of the Canadian public.

It has also referred to the competition aspect of the policy on transport and has agreed that the best way to maintain competition is to allow this transaction to happen.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN CITIZENSHIP

Mrs. Shirley Maheu (Saint-Laurent—Cartierville): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Multiculturalism and Citizenship. It is hard to understand why a child born abroad of Canadian parents automatically has Canadian citizenship, while a baby adopted abroad does not have that status. The parents have to wait more than two years. Do these children represent some kind of risk for this country? Why did the minister fail to amend the Citizenship Act as he promised?

Hon. Gerry Weiner (Minister of Multiculturalism and Citizenship): Madam Speaker, I was not aware of this particular case, but last February I established a procedure—

[*English*]

—to handle these types of cases quickly and compassionately.

If there are no documents missing, we should be able to do this kind of case in five to six weeks. I will personally look into this case and get back to the hon. member at the earliest possible moment.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Shirley Maheu (Saint-Laurent—Cartierville): Madam Speaker, in this particular case a family in my riding adopted a little girl in China. She was only a few months old when she arrived in Canada last May. So far the family has received no assistance from the bureaucracy in the minister's department. The parents will have to wait another year. I am glad to hear the minister say he will use his discretionary powers. I hope he will do so before the end of his term and help this family which is suffering the consequences of this government's inefficiency.

Hon. Gerry Weiner (Minister of Multiculturalism and Citizenship): I want to thank the hon. member for raising this matter. As I said, I will look into this particular case and get back to the hon. member in the not too distant future.

* * *

[*English*]

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Dan Heap (Trinity—Spadina): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

• (1455)

Amnesty International's update report of June 1993 entitled "Mexico: The Persistence of Torture and Impunity" which I sent to the minister this morning states: "The Mexican government has repeatedly promised to defend human rights and to punish those who violate them. Yet torture is still widespread and to the knowledge of Amnesty International nobody has yet been sentenced for the crime of torture in Mexico".

My question to the minister is this. What action has the minister taken to insist that Canada's proposed partner in the North American free trade agreement begin to enforce the human rights principles that President Salinas has claimed to uphold for five years?

Hon. Barbara McDougall (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Madam Speaker, when I was in Mexico just over a week ago I stressed again what the government has been stressing with the Mexican government, including in my meeting with President Salinas, our concern for human rights in Mexico and in other countries in the region and our encouragement that they continue down the path of trying to better their human rights record in Mexico. I want to assure the hon. member, knowing his interest in the subject and my own, I think we have some mutual ground on this.

There has been considerable progress in Mexico. President Salinas and members of his cabinet regard it as fundamental to the kind of changes they want to bring to Mexico, that they open up their legal processes, improve them, improve their policing and all of the things that matter in a democratic society where human rights are respected and encouraged.

One of the facts we are encouraged by is that the Mexican National Human Rights Commission, which we in Canada have assisted to set in place, set some parameters for and worked with, has reported that complaints regarding torture have fallen dramatically. It is not at zero. It should be at zero. The president knows that and so do we. We will continue to work along these lines.

Mr. Dan Heap (Trinity—Spadina): Madam Speaker, still the sentences are at zero after five years of promises like the one we have heard.

My supplementary is for the Minister of International Trade. Since this government signed the North American free trade agreement, giving up some of Canada's sovereign control over our natural resources and our trade to a North American administration shared with the government of Mexico, is this government aware of the continued widespread, unpunished human rights violations by Mexico's police since President Salinas took office five years ago? These are violations of the rights of peasants, trade union members, journalists and opposition politicians. How does the minister condone by silence in his negotiations the brutal practice of oppression by the Salinas government and how can the minister assure this House that we—

Madam Deputy Speaker: I am afraid the question has been asked. Would the hon. member please end it?

Mr. Heap: Yes. The question is how these unfree workers and unfree peasants of Mexico are now being forced to provide unfair competition to Canadians.

Hon. Barbara McDougall (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Madam Speaker, the second question really does not reflect the reality of the negotiating stance this government has taken or the kind of commitments that have been made by the Mexican government.

We always walk a fine line between trying to encourage human rights in other countries while not isolating them. The important thing is that through the negotiating strategy this has been discussed at every other venue that we have with the Mexican government. The encouragement that Canada has provided has had tangible results.

Of course we would like to see more. So would the Mexican government. I think by continuing to press the issue and to work with them as partners and not isolate them in the international economic arena we will have a lot more impact than by sitting outside or simply trying to punish them.

* * *

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

Mr. David Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of State for Youth.

The minister knows the unemployment rate among young Canadians is at a horrendous level. Although the minister has made reference to the fact that SEED funding has increased for this fiscal year it is nowhere near the level it was in 1985. In point of fact, there has been a 44 per cent decrease and 40,000 fewer jobs were made available under the SEED program.

• (1500)

Why is the Minister of State for Youth not fighting for additional funding in cabinet in order to provide much needed assistance to our young people who need that kind of economic opportunity to pursue their post-secondary studies as well as return to high schools and other kinds of training in this country?

Hon. Pierre H. Cadieux (Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport) and Minister of State (Youth) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, the hon. member makes the same mistake his colleague made a little while ago.

They dissociate SEED from the Challenge program which in fact has increased over the years, bearing in mind that some of the moneys have been allocated to the high drop-out situation we have in Canada which is absolutely scandalous. It was discovered at that time the drop-out rate was 33 per cent. We know that the most important tool that the students require is a good education so that they can face the challenges that are upcoming.

This year alone the budget was increased by $5.1 million, preceded by $3 million the year before and $3 million the year before that. Again the moneys have been increased and are increasing. I did fight in cabinet for it and that is why it increased.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Charles A. Langlois (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and to Minister of Natikonal Defence): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 35 petitions.

[*Editor's Note: See today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

* * *

[*English*]

CENTENNIAL FLAME RESEARCH AWARD ACT

TABLING OF ANNUAL REPORT

Mr. Bruce Halliday (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present two reports.

The first, which is in the usual format as well as in the alternate formats of Braille, computer disc, large print and audio cassette, is the first annual report pursuant to clause 7(1) of the Centennial Flame Research Award Act. This annual report includes the report of the first recipient of the award, Ms Sharon Houlihan from Whitehorse, Yukon. She has written a report on Ms. Judi Johnny, an impassioned advocate for the rights of aboriginal persons with disabilities.

* * *

HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE STATUS OF DISABLED PERSONS

FIFTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Bruce Halliday (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table in the usual format as well as in the alternate formats of Braille, computer disc, large print and an audio cassette the fifth report of the Standing Committee on Human Rights and the Status of Disabled Persons entitled *Signposts*.

This report represents an assessment of the work of the committee during the 34th Parliament and suggests future priorities for the committee including a strong recommendation that it be maintained in the next Parliament.

[*Editor's Note: See today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

* * *

INCOME TAX ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-136, an act to amend the Income Tax Act.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Pursuant to Standing Order 68(2), the motion is deemed adopted.

Mr. Mazankowski moves that the bill be now read the first time and printed.

Pursuant to Standing Order 69(1), the motion is deemed adopted.

Bill read the first time and printed.

* * *

BARLEY MARKETING PLEBISCITE ACT, 1993

MEASURE TO ENACT

Mr. John Harvard (Winnipeg St. James) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-456, an act to provide for a plebiscite respecting the marketing of barley by the Canadian Wheat Board.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Pursuant to Standing Order 68(2), the motion is deemed adopted.

Mr. Harvard: Mr. Speaker, this bill is clear and straightforward. It would provide for a plebiscite for the marketing of barley. Barley growers would be asked if they were in favour of retaining the current marketing mandate of the Canadian Wheat Board for barley.

• (1505)

I brought this bill forward because prairie farmers are frustrated. Without any mandate from producers this government has moved to a continental barley market effective August 1. Farmers feel that this is wrong and that it will undermine the Canadian Wheat Board. Producers feel they should be given the final say in this matter through a plebiscite and this bill would provide exactly that.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Mr. Harvard moves that the bill be now read the first time and printed.

Pursuant to Standing Order 69(1), the motion is deemed adopted.

Bill read the first time and printed.

* * *

PETITIONS

GASOLINE PRICES

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker, this petition has to do with the unfair high gasoline prices in the national capital region.

Over and over again constituents from Ottawa Centre as well as constituents in the national capital region are outraged with the unfair high gasoline prices. They are once again calling on this House to urge the government to take all necessary steps in order to correct this injustice for the people of this region.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. Willie Littlechild (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am proud to present two petitions, both of them certified correct as to form and content.

The first is from constituents mainly from Ponoka, Thorsby, Leduc and Tees, who call upon Parliament to enact legislation providing for a referendum of the people binding upon Parliament to accept or reject two official languages, English and French, for the government and the people of Canada.

PEACE TRUST FUND

Mr. Willie Littlechild (Wetaskiwin): The second one is mainly from Ponoka, Red Deer, Wetaskiwin and other areas like Prince Rupert and Bluffton.

These petitioners ask Parliament to establish a peace trust fund which would allow Canadian taxpayers who for reasons of conscience or religion choose to redirect the portion of their taxes paid to the government away from military uses and to a fund which would use the resources so directed for peace, education, research, humanitarian aid and other peaceful purposes.

VIOLENCE

Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition signed by dozens of petitioners in east metropolitan Toronto.

Occasioned by the recent release of a repeated child molester in Ontario, they ask Parliament to address reform of the Criminal Code, the Parole Act and the Penitentiary Act.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. Al Horning (Okanagan Centre): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present seven petitions with 240 names on behalf of a group of my constituents who humbly call upon Parliament to enact legislation which would allow a referendum of the people calling upon Parliament to accept or reject two official languages, English and French, for the government and the people of Canada.

GASOLINE PRICES

Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to present a petition signed by numerous residents of the Ottawa area protesting the high cost of gas in this region.

I can say that in Kingston on Thursday evening gas prices went from 49 cents a litre to 56 cents a litre at many of the major distribution points. This is purely an attempt at gas price gouging for the weekend because the prices generally go back down on Mondays. This is the third or fourth time at least this year that this has happened.

These constituents protest this kind of pricing, which is predatory and unfair pricing, that is being engaged in and have signed this petition calling on this House to do something to bring this kind of situation to an end.

COURT CHALLENGES PROGRAM

Ms. Mary Clancy (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a number of different petitions.

The first is 198 petitions with over 8,000 names of petitioners who call upon the government to reinstate as soon as possible the Court Challenges Program. I think that this would be particularly significant given the recent developments in the Conservative Party.

POVERTY

Ms. Mary Clancy (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, I have 67 petitions with over 2,600 names in which people from all across the country call upon Parliament to take the actions necessary to reaffirm its commitment to seek the elimination of poverty among children in Canada by the year 2000 and to develop a plan for the implementation of this commitment.

HOUSING

Ms. Mary Clancy (Halifax): The last group of petitions with over 4,000 names asks the Government of Canada to reinstate funding for housing projects, in particular the co-operative housing program.

CANADA POST

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a very lengthy petition from the riding of York West which I have the honour to represent.

Constituents are complaining that their postal station Downsview C was closed but also closed without—and I underline the word without—any public input at all. Canada Post is supposed to serve those Canadians.

• (1510)

They are asking that it not only revisit this decision of closing Downsview Postal Station C but that it amend the process so that Canadians can be part of the equation and not told at the end that the service their tax dollars are paying for is no longer in operation.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. David D. Stupich (Nanaimo—Cowichan): Mr. Speaker, I have petitions to present that have been certified correct as to form and content by the Clerk.

The petitioners argue that Canada has enacted legislation providing for two official languages, that the concept of two official languages has been entrenched in our Constitution and the major political parties have acted in concert in the aforesaid matters without consulting with and receiving a mandate from the people of Canada.

They say that the report of the citizens' forum conducted by Keith Spicer as part of the referendum indicated that a substantial majority of Canadians is opposed to two official languages and the actions of the government and the continuing actions of the political parties have disenfranchised the people of Canada on the subject of two official languages.

The petitioners call upon Parliament to have a referendum on the question of whether or not we should have two languages. The acceptance or rejection of the proposed amendments would be determined by a majority vote of those votes cast in the whole of Canada together with a majority vote in the majority of provinces, with the territories being given the status of one province.

While I may not agree with the petitioners they have a right to be heard in Parliament and I am pleased to present these petitions.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. Charles A. Langlois (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and to Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, if questions Nos. 318 and 423 could be made orders for returns, these returns would be tabled immediately.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it the pleasure of the House that questions Nos. 318 and 423 be deemed to have been made orders for returns?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Text*]

Question No. 318—**Mr. Young (Acadie—Bathurst):**

1. For the 1990-91 fiscal year, with respect to the development and maintenance of Electric Data Processing (E.D.P) systems in government departments, (a) what was the cost (b) what were the details of purchases?

2. Since 1985-86 to the present, have any E.D.P. specific purpose systems been developed that have, or will, cost over $500,000 and, if so, (a) for which departments (b) what is the purpose of each system and, in each case for each system, completed or uncompleted, (i) what were the original and actual costs (ii) what were the original and actualy completion dates (c) what systems have been developed in-house?

Return tabled.

Question No. 423—**Mr. Young (Acadie—Bathurst):**

For the fiscal year 1989-90 and 1990-91, were any sole source contracts awarded by departments other than Supply and Services and, if so, (a) how many (b) how many were personal services contracts (c) for each department, what was the total dollar value of such contracts?

Return tabled.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Langlois: Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

NORTHUMBERLAND STRAIT CROSSING ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-110, an act respecting the Northumberland Strait Crossing, as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee; and Motions Nos. 11 and 12 (p. 20737).

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak this afternoon on Bill C-110. Although I am the critic for government operations for our party I have not yet spoken on this bill to date preferring, as we all should, to ensure that my colleagues from Atlantic Canada, particularly those from P.E.I. and New Brunswick, be given the first opportunity to speak on this very important issue for their region.

I want to endorse whole-heartedly the comments of my colleagues from P.E.I and those that have been made by the premier of P.E.I. the Hon. Catherine Callbeck, former member of this House and current premier of that province.

A vast majority of the people of Prince Edward Island favour the adoption of this bill, and so do I. The people of P.E.I., through their legislative assembly, are in the process right now of adopting the constitutional amendment that is required pursuant to a recent court decision. I would like to quote from a speech given by the premier of P.E.I. I know that our colleagues in the NDP would want to listen to this, at least I hope they would want to listen to this. I should not be so presumptuous as to say that I know they would want to listen to it because one never knows with the NDP.

• (1515)

When the premier of P.E.I. introduced the resolution she said in her speech to the legislature: "Madam Speaker, a clear majority of Islanders support this project. The federal government supports this project

and this government supports this project. After seven years of extensive debate, study and consultation Islanders want this project to proceed". The premier went on to describe how the project was needed and how the resolution would then be debated in the legislative assembly of that particular province.

This morning all members of this House and all Canadians were listening to the remarks of the hon. member for Skeena in which he alleged corruption, impropriety and virtually everything else on the part of everyone except him. Those are the very sad comments we heard. Presumably his comments were also with reference to the people of that region, to those who represent them in the legislative assembly and to those who represent them here in Ottawa.

I do not think that many members of this House have a lot to learn in the way of ethics from the hon. member for Skeena, who crossed the floor and put a dead fish on the desk of another member of this House. Nor do we have any lectures to take from the NDP on ethics, particularly not the NDP in Prince Edward Island of all places. We know that in P.E.I. and elsewhere in Atlantic Canada being a member of the NDP is not very popular. It is about as popular as being a member of the Marxist–Leninist Party or the Rhinoceros Party. None of those people enjoy any support at all.

Mr. Butland: Out of order, Mr. Speaker. That is not relevant.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, the member for Sault Ste. Marie says that those remarks are not relevant to the debate. He should have been here to heckle the member for Skeena this morning. I do not know whether the member was here this morning, probably not, because he would have heckled his own colleague right out of the House at that time for the comments he made.

Mr. Butland: Shame.

Mr. Boudria: I know he says "shame" and I agree with him. They were indeed shameful comments that were made at that particular time.

I thank the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie for supporting that proposition that the comments of the member for Skeena this morning were inappropriate.

What we are here to talk about is the amendment proposed by my colleague from Ottawa West and the bill in general.

Mr. Fulton: Where is she?

Mr. Boudria: I whole-heartedly support the comments of the member for Ottawa West, the amendments that she proposed to this bill to give greater authority to ensure that the environment—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): It is a little warm today in Ottawa, and I know it is a little warm in here. However I do not want to reprimand the hon. member for saying who is and who is not in the House. He knows that, he has been here a long time. I would appreciate if we could have a little decorum.

Mr. Boudria: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, but what do you expect from someone who puts dead fish on other MPs' desks?

Mr. Butland: One-sided, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Boudria: One side of the fish only? Perhaps. Nevertheless the dead fish was there from the deadbeats of the New Democrats.

If I can get back to the issue at hand, we support this bill. We feel that some amendments could make the bill, which is a good bill, even better. That is the position that we in this party have constantly taken. That does not mean that we do not want proper and rigorous environmental assessments. Approximately 22 of those studies have been done already, a stack of them probably as high as the hon. member for Skeena is tall, and that is a pretty tall stack of studies.

We have had all these environmental studies done and we in the Liberal opposition want to join with the people of P.E.I. who want to see their lot improved. We want to join with the people of New Brunswick who also want their part in this project. We want to join with all Canadians from Atlantic Canada in wanting things to be better in that part of the world.

• (1520)

I know that we cannot please everyone. We cannot please people like the member for Skeena or others who come pontificating from afar on how they feel about something thousands of miles away that is going to be in the best interest of the people from that region. They are going to say that they do not think this is appropriate and they are going to leave, probably never to come back.

Mr. Fulton: And who are you?

Mr. Boudria: Who am I? I am the critic. I think that gives me some authority to speak in favour of this bill. Certainly as much as the hon. member for Skeena who this morning made disparaging remarks against every member of this House except himself, the people of P.E.I. and the legislatures and elected people at the provincial level in those two provinces and presumably all others who disagree with him. We do not take very many moral lessons from the likes of that.

I want to conclude my remarks very briefly. This is getting to the end of this session. I want to say a word about the member for Central Nova, the Minister of Public Works. I have had the opportunity to be a critic in this House for quite some time and I want to take this opportunity to give my good wishes to the Minister of Public Works.

When I came here in 1984 it did not take long to discover that those who were holding power in that department at the time were not doing a very good job of it. I do not want to dig up everything that was said in 1984, 1985, 1986 and so on about the administration of the Department of Public Works. It was in a pretty bad state at that time.

However I am pleased to see that things have improved quite a bit over recent years. No doubt a certain amount of that credit goes to the present minister, his parliamentary secretary and some of the people they have hired to straighten things out in that department. Things were very bad a few years ago. We all remember what they were like and there is no purpose in rereading all of that into the public record now. The record stands and unfortunately we all know what it was like at one time.

I just wanted to take a moment to add that before this Parliament ends, which I understand will be in a very few days from now. There may very well be a new session. If there is one under the soon to be appointed new Prime Minister then that particular session would be very short prior to the next election. I suspect that there may not even be a recall of Parliament after the new Prime Minister takes over. We will be in an election soon.

I wanted to take the opportunity to state that, to bring it to the attention of the House, and to urge my colleagues to do everything in their power for the adoption of Bill C-110. Let us do our small part in this House to give opportunities to the people of Atlantic Canada. We have the opportunity to do that now, to safeguard the environment and at the same time to do a bit of good. We can safeguard the environment and at the same time create job opportunities. It will protect the great riches that we have there and at the same time will make life better for our brothers and sisters who live in that part of this great country.

I am pleased to be a member of the Liberal caucus that supports this initiative. We want the initiative to be even better but we will stand by the people of Atlantic Canada at this time when they want and need the help of all members of this House. It is not a time for the disparaging and insensitive remarks that we heard this morning from the hon. member for Skeena.

Mr. Steve Butland (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, I would like very much to speak to the P.E.I. bridge. I would like to speak to the link, as it is called even if it is a generic bridge, and the generic studies that were done.

• (1525)

We are certainly getting off topic. I hope the condescending tone as exemplified by the previous speaker will end.

He took great delight in raking my colleague from Skeena over the coals and I think misplaced censure of his comments. The fact that the member for Skeena happens to be very passionate in the area of environment does not lend itself to the necessity of stooping to this level of debate.

Let us bring the debate back to what we are really talking about. It is the P.E.I. link and the New Democratic Party does not make any excuses or offer any apologies for speaking to this.

I have a great deal of respect for the members from P.E.I. I think they are some of the finest gentlemen I have met in this House. However last week one of the members said: "How dare you come into this House and pontificate to us from P.E.I.? How dare you do this when you are from a thousand miles away?"

I take exception to that. Normally we do not operate under that kind of environment here, if you will excuse the term. We are allowed to speak about one another's areas of expertise, projects, initiatives and legislation that applies to constituencies across this country. I hope the members of P.E.I. will allow us in the New Democratic Party to speak to this issue without denigrating us

and saying we have no business talking about this and we are against Atlantic Canada.

I want to point out that a plebiscite was held several years ago about some kind of link. The vote at that time was 60–40. I do not know what it would be now but I would really like to find out. The bottom line is whether it is wrong to stand up and speak on behalf of that 40 per cent of the people. Do we have to apologize and say we do not live in P.E.I. or on the east coast? I am sorry but I am going to speak for these people.

Believe me at committee there were lots of people willing to come forward. Those who were allowed to come forward spoke very passionately in opposition to the link therefore we do speak for some people. We are not here to just obstruct the project. We are here to represent some people.

I respect the member for Skeena. He is our environment critic and he is a darn good environment critic. Members of the House have said from time to time recently they are going to miss him. He is an environmental conscience for a lot of people in this country.

I am happy to speak to the link and why we are opposed to it. This bill brought forward is very narrow in scope. Any amendments we brought forward that would have had any impact were ruled out of order. That has to give us some concerns.

This is not a mini project. It started off with $600 million. It has gone up to $850 million which is the amount the proponent is going to raise to build the project. I understand it has burgeoned to a billion-plus dollars and yet we are told we should not be speaking to this. It is not our project.

One of the rationale given to support it was that it ends up in the riding of the Leader of the Opposition. That is great rationale for why we should support it. He is not upset, along with a couple of premiers of the Atlantic provinces. They each have one vote and one opinion just like the rest of us.

I feel very assured coming forward. Last week after I rose people from Prince Edward Island called and told me to keep it up. A lot of them appreciate what we in the NDP are doing on this initiative. They are not all in favour of the fixed link. Surely all sides of the House are prepared to listen to the opposing viewpoints.

• (1530)

Certainly from the government's side the silence is somewhat deafening. It told me very bluntly it is in our ball court. The intimation was to get this over with, deal with it as quickly as possible and get it to third reading. Let us have a vote and get it over with. We are all in a hurry for the summer recess.

This is not a small project. This is a megaproject. As I have said from the beginning, a developer came forward and said: "Well, look folks. We want to build you something. We want to build you a bridge". A developer came forward and said in altruistic fashion: "We want to do this for the people of Canada. We want to do it for Atlantic Canada to create jobs".

There are altruistic developers out there, but not all of them. Some of them are in the business of making a great deal of money at the expense of others. We are just putting it forward. What if this is a $1 billion boondoggle? What if 35 years down the road the people of Canada are left with this monstrosity? What if within the 35-year limit the ice does cause the damage that the Friends of the Island and the people who work out there say could happen. What if that happens? It is going to be too late then.

It is imperative that we bring these concerns forward and let people know about the many amendments we proffered that were ruled out of order because the government said they went beyond the scope of the bill. I cannot help but be reminded of the NAFTA agreement. The government said this is the bill but you cannot have any of these labour or environmental accords. I think the analogy is a very good one.

This bill only deals with the contractual part of this bridge. It is a business piece of legislation, but we cannot bring anything in about the environment because it goes beyond the scope of the bill. My friend from the Liberal Party has brought forth an amendment but I am sure she would acknowledge the fact that it really does not say anything. I know she cares about the environment but this particular amendment is full of weasel words that really do not add anything to what the bill could say.

We are attempting to at least get the debate on the floor and delete the clauses one by one because the amendments with any substantial content in them have been ruled out of order. We really resent that.

I have not gone into many of the reasons why we oppose this bill. Here is just one of them and people can accuse us and say it is a red herring. Here is a report from the Department of Tourism in P.E.I. in 1988. It is not that long ago.

> Visitors will be encouraged by creating attractions appropriate to our environment and activities in harmony with the conservation and preservation of that environment. It does not appear possible that a concrete and steel megaproject will be consistent with the Island's pursuit of this goal.
>
> A massive concrete and steel structure spanning the waters of the Gulf will impair perception of the Island as a natural and tranquil place.

The Department of Tourism in P.E.I. said this in 1988. It is not something only we are bringing forward. Because of my interest and because of the accusation that I have never been to P.E.I. or read *Anne of Green Gables* I took the book out. They motivated me to read the book and at third reading I am going to read to some of the members to make them aware and mindful of the beauty and tranquillity of the Island. There are many on the Island who want to appreciate that forever and ever.

I know some of the members do not really want to hear this. It is a $1 billion dollar plus project that not everybody is in favour of. There are business people who came forward from the Island and said this will really destroy the character of P.E.I. It has not touched upon displacement of workers, the extra cost of the financing and the sceptical net benefit of the entire project. It has not touched upon the environmental specifics of the project for which we have grave concerns that the member for Skeena has brought forward.

• (1535)

This is why we have proposed the multi-amendments and unfortunately most of them have been ruled out of order. Nevertheless we want to proffer them for the benefit of the House but more importantly for the people of Canada and the unknown percentage of people in Atlantic Canada and Prince Edward Island

Mr. Len Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke): Mr. Speaker, I certainly did not want this bill to go by without saying a few words about it. What we are talking about today is yet another phase of Confederation itself. The history behind the building of the fixed link with Prince Edward Island goes back to its entry into Confederation in 1873 and for several decades before that.

Everything we seem to do or try to do to enlarge on Confederation or the transportation system of this country seems to become a great issue with Canadians. They want to discuss it thoroughly. Today there is a lot of concern about environmental issues and they will be and have been addressed. There will be considerable discussion on those yet as they proceed.

The commitment Canada made to Prince Edward Island when it entered Confederation in 1873 was that a continuous transportation system would be put in place between the island and the mainland. At that time steam boat was the main means of transit and since then there have been attempts to bring in a highway or causeway. In the first election campaign in which I ran in 1965 believe it or not, Mr. Speaker, the causeway between New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island was one of the big issues. This is not a recent issue. It has been an ongoing issue since Confederation.

My experience with the transportation system to Prince Edward Island is one of sitting in one of those great line-ups of traffic waiting for a place on the ferry. Certainly I could not help but imagine what it would be like for business people trying to do business between the Island and the mainland when they had to sit there sometimes for hours on end waiting for transportation to the mainland.

There comes a time when the nation must grow. There comes a time when Confederation must be expanded upon. There also comes a time in the over-all picture of Canada when we have to look at the over-all national transportation system.

Regions of this country have recently lost their railway transportation, their passenger service and their link to many areas outside their particular regions. That is a negative growth for Confederation. The main underlying feeling in all discussions at the time of Confederation and as provinces and territories came into Confederation was that a national government has a responsibility to build the various parts of this nation and link them together with transportation facilities.

• (1540)

Even today in my own Ottawa valley we are about to lose the Canadian Pacific Railway link between Mattawa and Smith Falls. It was completed between the early 1880s and 1885 as part of the first transportation link across this country. This is a time of great emotion for many people. It is a time of change for those communities which will be losing their railways.

Therefore, while we talk about building facilities in one area of Canada, we must also at the same time talk about losing facilities in other regions of the country.

I want to join with others in the Liberal Party in supporting Prince Edward Island and indeed Atlantic Canada in the building of this link to Prince Edward Island. This project will mean a great deal to that island. Yes, it is going to change their way of life when it is completed because it is going to speed up the process of operations of day-to-day living in that province. Undoubtedly it will bring more people to Prince Edward Island. It will be part of getting to know our nation better. Canadians should be travelling their country today and learning more about it.

My experience, having visited Prince Edward Island on many occasions and doing business with people there, is that they are very accommodating people. They are very kind-hearted and very proud of their history. In this day and age when history receives so little attention at times, it does my heart good to see a part of this country that is really appreciated by the people for its background and its historic perspective.

It was mentioned by a previous speaker that on a referendum held in Prince Edward Island they voted 60 per cent to 40 per cent in favour of a new transportation link. It is also said today, rightly or wrongly, that if another referendum were taken today it could very well be 70:30. We would not know that of course until such a vote was taken, but it shows there is a consensus to build a new link in order to have a better transportation link with the other parts of the nation.

Ways of life will change in Prince Edward Island as they have changed in other parts of Canada. When we visit Prince Edward Island from other parts of this nation we learn that P.E.I. is a unique province. We are talking today about a fixed link that is going to be part of that national transportation system. It has been talked about for years, as I mentioned.

In 1873 when the people of the day worked on bringing P.E.I. into Confederation they had a vision for the future of Canada. They were able to project their views into that future. Today, as Canadians, I sometimes think that we are so tied up in the day-to-day issues, we are so worried about what happened yesterday, what is going to happen today and what will happen tomorrow that we are not giving the proper, in-depth vision to the real future of this country. It is time we did that. That is why I am glad to see so many people supporting Prince Edward Island's desire for a better transportation link with the rest of Canada.

• (1545)

As I said in the beginning, this is a part of the continuation of the building of Canada's Confederation. Surely those of us in the House today, those in the provincial legislatures affected in Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick in particular, will look to the future with a renewed vision as to how they can improve their part of Canada.

No matter where we live in Canada it is up to Canadians, who have a desire to have unity and communication with people, to support the desires of people who need good transportation links in other parts of the country as well.

It is not fitting today I know for me to talk about the railway system that we are losing in my part of the country in the Ottawa valley but I hope I will have another opportunity to do that.

Mr. Speaker, you have been very kind to let me say a few words on the Prince Edward Island issue today. I wish the new premier and her new government every success as they grapple with this issue.

Ms. Mary Clancy (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, before I begin my remarks on the fixed link I would like to compliment my hon. colleague from Pembroke and to say we are delighted he is back here with us in the House. We are always delighted to listen to his words of wise counsel.

I want to talk about two things in my remarks today. The first is a little bit of history. Twenty-five years ago, in 1968, along with a group of students from Nova Scotia I

took the old ferry, the *Abegweit* from Cape Tormentine in New Brunswick to Prince Edward Island. It was in February, in winter, and we got stuck in the ice for between four to six hours.

I probably neglected to say I was going to Prince Edward Island for an Atlantic provinces student Liberal meeting. When we finally got to the other side we were met by the former premier of Prince Edward Island, the Hon. Alex Campbell, now Mr. Justice Campbell of the Prince Edward Island Supreme Court.

In his welcoming remarks to the students, he made what I can only call an impassioned plea for a fixed link because, as he said, what had happened to us that particular night happened all too frequently, whether people were coming to Prince Edward Island on business, as tourists, bringing truckloads of materials or trying to get off the island with materials, potatoes or anything else.

I want to say something about the way we are in Atlantic Canada. I listened with interest to the comments of the members from Skeena and Sault Ste. Marie, members for whom I have both a modicum of affection and respect in spite of their poor choice of parties. I want to say something to them. Perhaps I do not say it in as dramatic terms as my colleague from Cape Breton—East Richmond did, but I say it to them nonetheless. With the greatest of respect and affection, those gentlemen are talking through their hats.

An hon. member: I never wear one.

Ms. Clancy: Maybe you should wear a hat. The point is that there are studies. My colleague from Cape Breton—East Richmond in his impassioned remarks earlier today listed the scads of studies that tell us with a few fairly minor exceptions that the fixed link will be in the main benign. What is not benign, what is malign in Atlantic Canada today is the unemployment rate. I was up just a few minutes ago talking about the fact that the unemployment rate for students in Nova Scotia last year was 23.8 per cent. That is just for students.

• (1550)

In parts of Nova Scotia and Atlantic Canada the unemployment rate is as high as 30 per cent. What are we talking about? What are my colleagues in that corner talking about if we say that a project that is going to provide jobs to great numbers of maritimers, to Atlantic Canadians in general, is something that must be stopped at all costs.

With the greatest of respect, those of us from Atlantic Canada turn, face these people and tell them to mind their own business. We need this project. My former colleague from Malpeque, currently the premier of Prince Edward Island, the first woman elected premier in this country is not—and anyone who knew Catherine Callbeck in this House knows I speak the truth on this—someone who looks at the future of her province, whether we are talking about its employment future or its environmental future, lightly. She does not make rash decisions. Indeed, if there are two words that are mutually exclusive in the language they would be "rash" and "Callbeck".

The premier of Prince Edward Island asked me specifically to speak in favour of this. She did not have to because I understand. But I am grateful that she would want my support and she has it, as do my colleagues and the people of Prince Edward Island along with, indeed, the people in Atlantic Canada who are going to get much-needed jobs out of the project.

I cannot underline this word too often. The word is jobs. That word in Atlantic Canada with the majority of the policies of this government over the last nine years, has been a word that has been far too often absent from the Atlantic Canadian lexicon.

On top of the whole question of jobs and the spin-off from those jobs is the whole question of the isolation of Prince Edward Island because of the strait. There is the whole question of the fact that when the ice fills in the Northumberland Strait in the wintertime one can, as I did in that winter month in 1968, spend four to six hours or longer trying to get across the strait. It does not take a rocket scientist to figure out that this could be counter productive for business on Prince Edward Island.

There are also problems with airline service to Prince Edward Island. Do not even get me started on the problems of airline service in this country generally. I say, don't press your luck, to my hon. colleague from Sault Ste. Marie.

The transportation problems in this country are mammoth: the distances, the costs, the geography and the climate. Every single one of us in every region of the country knows whereof I speak. We have all spoken about these things millions of times in this Chamber over the years. This project is needed.

Mr. Crosbie: You're speaking and we're doing.

Ms. Clancy: I cannot believe that the hon. minister of fisheries does not support me in this. I cannot believe the hon. minister of fisheries is heckling my support for a government project. I am crushed. I may even say that I am hurt in my finer feelings. However, I shall somehow try to soldier on in spite of the comments of the hon. minister. He had best look to his laurels.

I shall continue to ignore assiduously his comments as I speak in support. This is one of the few things I have ever supported. Heaven knows in the dying days of this government that justly deserves to die I will probably never do so again.

However after I was so rudely interrupted by the hon. minister I go back and say how important this project is to the economy not just of Prince Edward Island, not just of New Brunswick but of Nova Scotia as well. The spin-off, the jobs created, the general boost to our economy in maritime and Atlantic Canada is unquestionable. We must have it.

• (1555)

While I appreciate that hon. members in the New Democratic Party want to do what is best for the people of Atlantic Canada, let me say that there are 20 of us here in the Liberal Party who represent the interests of Atlantic Canada. I think that we know what our constituents want and we know what is best for Atlantic Canada.

We also know that the environment must be preserved. We know how important these matters are. I can only reiterate that this project must go ahead.

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency): Mr. Speaker, I just want to make it clear that I was not disagreeing with the hon. member's support for this bill. I just wanted her to admit that they are supporting something that the government is taking action on.

Those in the Liberal Party of Canada have talked about the fixed link to Prince Edward Island for 20 or 30 years. God knows, they were in office from 1935—there was the Diefenbaker interregnum—basically until 1984. Despite all their promises they never did a single thing to carry out any of them. Now this great project is being carried forward by my colleague on the right, the hon. Minister of Public Works.

We are glad to see that there are some people in the Liberal ranks opposite who are prepared to support this bill and see it go forward.

Ms. Clancy: He does not want our support.

Mr. Crosbie: I dare say they do it because of a guilty conscience over the fact that they did nothing for the last 40 or 50 years in this direction. But at least they do know—

Ms. Clancy: John, magnanimity becomes you.

Mr. Crosbie: I am trying to be nice about the Liberal Party, which is not easy. This is a very formative experience in learning something about politics, right? You get into the Liberal Party for a few years and you are on to every trick in the book. Then you move on to a real party where you can express your idealism and principles.

Ms. Clancy: Which one would that be?

Mr. Crosbie: You come over to the Progressive Conservative Party.

Ms. Clancy: Did you join the Reform this morning?

Mr. Crosbie: To get on with my question, at least it is obvious that the members of the Liberal Party who represent districts in Atlantic Canada are fully supporting this. Compare that to the miserable show of the NDP in this House which has no members now in Atlantic Canada. It is quite easy to see why it has no members in Atlantic Canada. It will not support things that are good for Atlantic Canada. It is critical of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency.

The NDP opposed the Hibernia project. If it were not for the Hibernia project, it would not be a question of the GNP growing in Newfoundland in the next five years, it would be a steady downward spiral. The NDP did not care about that. That is why it has only one member I suppose in the whole Newfoundland legislature. The most it has ever had is one person and that is all it is ever going to have because it is not cognizant of what needs to be done in Atlantic Canada.

I congratulate the hon. member for Halifax. It is the first time I have seen her take a constructive position in this House in all her years here.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Before I recognize the hon. member for Trinity Spadina it is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 38 to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: The hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie—steel industry; the hon. member for Fredericton—York—Sunbury—job start program; and the hon. member for Don Valley East—multiculturalism.

Mr. Dan Heap (Trinity—Spadina): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak against this motion. In spite of the interjections of the hon. minister I believe it is an unwise motion for all concerned within Canada, but most of all for the people most directly concerned.

It is a motion to spend about $1.5 billion over 35 years to build a bridge from New Brunswick across the Northumberland Straits to Prince Edward Island. While we have heard arguments in favour of it, I believe there are two serious arguments against it.

• (1600)

The first argument is the inadequately studied effect on the environment. Yes, there have been many studies. By the law passed by this government there is the environmental assessment and review process that looked at the other studies. About 150 people spoke to the matter and gave many points of view. They were from the Island mainly, but from elsewhere also. The conclusion was that the idea of a bridge—not a particular bridge but a bridge idea—should not be approved at this time.

The point of the government setting up an environmental review process was to have that sort of thing heard. I mentioned that 150 people spoke but I believe ten times that many attended. The environmental review process had to take all those points of view into account.

Some of the points made by the environmental review process were that there was risk of damaging the near shore spawning grounds. Also there was a general feeling it could be incompatible with sustainable development. There were difficulties in finding socially acceptable solutions for the displaced ferry workers and fishermen, and I will come back to that.

There was concern generally that not enough attention had been given to the environmental impact on the Island, even on how tourism might be affected by the bridge. My colleague from Sault Ste. Marie mentioned the opinions expressed by Islanders, including business people as to what the bridge might do to tourism.

We have heard about the benefits of putting a community in communication. It has often been found in Ontario and also out west that it works two ways. Communication, travel or information can bring activity to a community, or it can suck activity out of a community. The concern was that it was not at all clear which way the bridge as contrasted with the ferry might affect Prince Edward Island.

Those are only some of the environmental concerns but they are very serious ones.

There has been a great deal of discussion over the past decade or longer about the fisheries off the Atlantic coast particularly off Newfoundland. The argument continues as to where the cod went. We should at least take warning that if we do not seriously consider the possibility that these sources may be destroyed perhaps forever, we could be very sorry later on.

This brings me to the second argument. A number of the Islanders who are very directly concerned, particularly the ferry workers and fishermen, oppose this project.

We heard about jobs. Somebody has estimated 1,000 jobs. Well 700 jobs stand to be in danger. Whether there is any sure basis for 1,000 construction jobs has not been made clear. We know the company doing this project is foreign based. From experience we can expect that it will do its best to make sure most of the profit and if possible most of the jobs go to the United States or Britain where that company is based.

We have often been disappointed by rose coloured prospects of jobs from foreign investments that turned out the other way. They sucked jobs out of the country instead of putting jobs in the country. To drop 700 ferry jobs for an unknown number of construction jobs may not be wise. That is 700 jobs per year for the ferry crews contrasted with an unknown number of construction jobs per year over the next 35 years and unknown indirect effects on jobs and businesses on the Island itself. Perhaps more jobs will be gained, perhaps not.

• (1605)

Therefore I support the motion of the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie that clause 4 of the bill be deleted. That is the clause by which Parliament gives up all concern for any effect of this bridge on employment, the environment, or anything else. It simply says the government can sign a contract with a company and that is it.

In particular, clause 4 indicates: "The minister may on behalf of Her Majesty in right of Canada enter into one or more agreements in respect of the crossing. These agreements entered into under this section may include (a) provisions respecting the design, maintenance, financing, development, construction and operation of the crossing". In other words, from now on Parliament will have nothing to say about any of those important matters.

Clause 4 continues: "(b) undertakings in relation to industrial and employment benefits"—a pig in a poke—"(c) provisions respecting the tolls, fees or other charges that may be imposed in respect of the crossing". In other words, we do not know what this bridge is going to cost Islanders in terms of prices of products to be brought across the bridge instead of being brought as now by the guaranteed ferry service.

It is unfortunate that many of the other amendments were ruled out of order, but I can understand that clause seems to have that effect. I hope members will delete that clause to at least leave open the possibility of looking at various matters that have not as yet been looked at, such as halting the proceedings until the Friends of the Island court case has been completed.

This morning an hon. member for the Liberal Party referred to the problem of delay that can be caused by a court case. It is better to look at it first rather than afterward. There is the uncertainty of the constitutional amendment that has not been passed. Another matter is asking the National Transportation Agency to show what the cost of the ferry will be as compared to the cost of the subsidy for the new bridge.

A number of other matters should be considered by this House not only because of the cost of $1.5 billion that will be laid upon the whole of Canada, but also the benefits that should be secured.

For example, there should be a plan for re-employment of at least half of the ferry workers. There should be a plan to deal with the ice problem, so that it does not destroy the fisheries. We cannot rely on SCI, a foreign corporation, to take care of those things adequately. It is not clear that the government will negotiate them adequately. Therefore Parliament should have the opportunity to speak and decide on those points.

While I recognize that quite possibly a majority of the people on the Island are in favour of this, there is a minority who are against it. There are times when the minority has been right. The minority voice should be heard, especially when it affects far more than just the people on Prince Edward Island.

I hope the government will reconsider this bill and at least allow this amendment which opens the way for bringing back those vital concerns I have mentioned.

• (1610)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Eugène Bellemare (Carleton—Gloucester): Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to speak to this bill, the purpose of which is to build a bridge between Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick.

My NDP colleagues seem to project a negative attitude to a bill that is supported by two Atlantic provinces. I wonder why members from other provinces insist on interfering in such a negative way in the affairs of Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick.

As a member from Ontario, I think the plan to build a bridge between Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick is an excellent idea and one that should have a very positive impact. The private sector is prepared to take on the project, while the government would guarantee the necessary loans.

We all know that the governments of Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick support this plan. We also know that the premiers of both provinces support it. According to the results of a plebiscite in Prince Edward Island, nearly 65 per cent of the population is in favour of building the bridge. It seems that if this plebiscite were held again today, it would probably be around 90 or 95 per cent.

As the NDP member just said, a minority is opposed to the project. Of course there are always people who like peace and quiet and don't want to be disturbed. They just want to be left alone. They are quite satisfied the way they are and they want things to stay that way. And so,

why build a bridge? I would ask those who are opposed to the project whether they have ever been to Prince Edward Island. Did they notice how difficult it can be to get to the Island at certain times of the year? Did they ever wait in line to get on the ferry that takes them there?

Did they consider the truckers who carry produce and who may have to wait one, two, three or even five hours? This doesn't do the produce any good, but just think what it costs per hour when those huge tractor trailers line up to cross with Canadian produce for foreign markets and are held up for several hours. A bridge would accelerate the transport of Canadian produce.

We tend to forget that we have a Trans-Canada Highway in this country. Should we deny Prince Edward Island a link with that network? Should we deny Prince Edward Island, the smallest province in Canada, this project? Should we leave this small province out in the cold just because we as residents of other provinces like Ontario, Quebec and the western provinces can easily vote down this small group of people?

Here in the House of Commons we should take a broader view and consider all regions. The Atlantic region lacks jobs. We have a fantastic opportunity to create jobs in Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick. What are we waiting for? There are people who say we should keep the ferries. Did they consider that repairs might be necessary or new ferries might have to be built? What would it cost to build these ferries, and I am not even considering maintenance costs?

• (1615)

If we have to choose between building new ferries at a tremendous cost or building a bridge, does it not it make more sense to build a bridge and avoid all the problems we have now with the ferries? The position taken by the NDP member who spoke previously is certainly not shared by the people in the Atlantic provinces.

Mr. Speaker, as a member from Ontario, and I repeat this with pride, it is with pleasure and a sense of duty toward my colleagues from the provinces of Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick that I support a bill they want and need. Canada as a whole should applaud this initiative.

[*English*]

Mr. David D. Stupich (Nanaimo—Cowichan): Mr. Speaker, the hon. House leader for the opposition in making his remarks today talked about the number of studies that have already been done. I wish I had been able to take notes as fast as he was referring to them but I just do not have the list.

In some cases some issues were studied four times. In one case one issue was studied something like 29 times. It makes me wonder about the nature of the studies. What were they studying? Where they studying the whole picture or where they studying little bits and pieces of it? If one has to have a second study after the first study has been done on the same issue then why the second? Is it because one doubts the credibility of the person who did the first study or because they did not do a good enough job?

We do not know. He did not tell us anything about the studies at all except to say how many had been done. It was as though the fact that there had been in total something like 100 studies done meant that was enough studying. It might be that one study done properly on the real questions would be plenty. If a credible consultant did the study then that is all one would need. When there are almost 100 studies then either one would think the studies have not been good enough or they have been too small and inconsequential to be of any real value in determining whether or not this project should go ahead. Even then can we be certain? That is the part that worries me.

I have a copy of a recent letter from the Central Northumberland Strait Fishermen's Association addressed to the Hon. Jean Charest, the Minister of the Environment. I do not intend to read the whole letter but there are some parts of it that I do want to read into the record. Reading from page two:

> For the record, the members of my organization and the P.E.I. Fishermen's Association are not satisfied with the amount of information that has been gathered.

They know that we have all those studies but they are still not satisfied. This is what they want:

> In particular, we share the concerns of DFO scientists about existing deficiencies in our knowledge of the Strait which include: serious data gaps in our knowledge of productivity, the dynamics and ecology of phytoplankton and zooplankton and life and history dynamics of all commercial species.

I would suggest that we are deficient in that kind of knowledge in all fishing areas. There are many arguments and ideas put forth as to what happened to the North Atlantic cod. Where did they disappear to or why did they disappear?

• (1620)

Why are they at the point of extinction? We just do not know in spite of all of the studying. Either we have not done enough studying or we have not gone far enough with our studies. We just do not know at this point but we do know that they have gone. They are not totally gone and not beyond recovery we hope.

Certainly that same thing could happen with respect to the Northumberland fisheries. It is valued at something like $100 million if we make a mistake and do something that is a disaster from an environmental point of view and destroys that fishery. There is that danger.

Is it worth going ahead with the project knowing that that could happen? We do not know that it will happen but are simply afraid that it might happen if we go ahead and construct this causeway between New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island.

Here are some other points:

> unquantified variation in ecosystem components against which impacts of structure will be impossible to measure.

They may not be right but they are saying that no study can give us the answer. It is just impossible to measure what the effect would be.

> urgent priority to calibrating a correlation between lobster larval surveys and lobster landings to be used as a tool for measuring environmental change.

From this one can only assume that, in spite of all of the studies that have been referred to by the hon. House leader for the opposition, we still do not know some critical information. We do not know the facts.

> lack of long-term, well-focused research on effects of the physical environment on the marine ecosystem making it impossible for the Science Branch to attribute any observed changes to any specific undertaking.

Certainly reading that one has to have some real doubts about all 100 of the studies.

> many unknowns and unanswerables which preclude the prediction of impacts on invertebrates.

> paucity of knowledge of distribution and movement patterns of larval and juvenile herring.

> lack of peer review of ice analysis.

> The conclusion that loss of a single year-class of herring would be a small impact is unacceptable.

These are the fishermen speaking. I think we should listen to them. There is danger. We do not know the answers. We do not even know if it is possible to get them but we certainly know that we have not done enough to get the answers that we would need before committing close to $1.5 billion of taxpayers' money on a solid connection between New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island.

I emphasize the world Island because it is an island. What is an island? It is some real estate that is surrounded by water. Part of the romance of travelling to Prince Edward Island— certainly tourism is extremely important there—is the knowledge that there are two ferry routes. That is part of the romance of Prince Edward Island. As someone said, that is where the founding convention for Canada was held. However, it is also one of the oldest provinces with the longest term populations.

My ancestors on one side came to Prince Edward Island several hundred years ago from the Isle of Skye. They came to an island. Once we tie it to the mainland with a bridge or a causeway then it is no longer an island. It is a peninsula perhaps or a projection from the main continent but no longer an island in the true sense of the word island.

What are we achieving by having this new connection? Perhaps it will be good for a few people. Perhaps it is going to be good for some businesses but I suspect that there will be a loss as well. Leaving aside for the moment the unknowns about the potential loss in the ocean itself and what it is going to do to sea life, we do know that it is going to change the pattern of life on Prince Edward Island.

I have not talked to my relations about it. I do not know how they feel about it but neither have they approached me to urge me to support or reject this proposal. We really need to know what the effect will be on the sea life and on the Island itself and put some figures on it.

We heard different speakers. We heard the hon. member for Skeena say that it is going to cost $1.4 billion. If it is extended a little further it is closer to $1.5 billion than $1.4 billion in the multiplication. Whatever, it is a lot of money to put into connecting an island with a population of something like 130,000 people to the mainland. Even among the 130,000 there is evidence that a significant number of them do not appreciate what Canada wants to do to them. A lot of them would rather be left as an island.

• (1625)

Is it worth dividing the Island's population further on this issue? Is it worth risking what we might be doing to the fisheries environment? Enough damage has been done to the fisheries of the east coast already and more damage is contemplated with respect to the fisheries on the west coast. We cannot take a chance on these issues. I would urge the House to vote against this proposition.

Mr. Francis G. LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso): Mr. Speaker, is a pleasure to be able to speak on this bill and to express my support for this project. I am glad to see that the minister for Atlantic development and fisheries is among us this afternoon listening carefully to our debate. I know that he is probably contemplating the creation of a fixed link to Newfoundland. That is in the future.

Today we are considering the project of a fixed link linking New Brunswick to Prince Edward island. To begin with I would like to say why I support this project because I have not been involved with the project in detail. I am supporting this project because first of all it is supported and has been supported by the vast majority of the people of Prince Edward Island after a great deal of public consultation, a plebiscite and a great deal of thought by Islanders about the impact this development would have on their way of life, their economy and the ecology of the Northumberland Strait through which the fixed link will pass.

It is not something that the people of Prince Edward Island take lightly. They have given this a great deal of thought. They have weighed all the issues and have come out strongly in favour of this project. I trust their very good common sense.

Second, I am supporting this project because it has been thoroughly studied. It has been the subject of a FEARO environmental review and many other environmental studies including a special panel which considered what effect a fixed crossing might have on the ice conditions in the Northumberland Strait.

It is true that the FEARO study which reported on this project in 1991 initially recommended against the project unless certain conditions were met. I am given to believe that those conditions have been met in the current project proposal. With the safeguards that have been made to preserve the environment, this project has all the necessary and reasonable precautions to ensure that the environment will not be unduly damaged.

I also support this project because it will demonstrate a new and innovative way of financing a major infrastructure project. It is a way of financing infrastructure which I think we in Canada and those in other countries will have to look at more carefully in the future. The idea that consortia can self-finance major projects of this type through revenues that the project will generate—in this case tolls on the bridge—is an idea worth considering and worth exploring and developing in these times of fiscal restraint.

This project is an example of that and for that reason it merits the support of this House. Those are the main reasons why I support this project. In addition it should not be forgotten that the project will be a major boost to the Atlantic economy in the form of construction work for a number of years.

• (1630)

It will stimulate the economy of a part of the country which I am sure the minister knows is severely depressed at the moment and which badly needs stimulus. The construction jobs will be very valuable to the people of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, P.E.I. and elsewhere in Canada. Therefore I support the project on economic grounds. I am confident the environmental precautions have been taken and that it has the required support of the people who matter most to this project, the people of Prince Edward Island.

The previous speaker from the NDP mentioned his concern with the island way of life, that the Islanders should not have this fixed link imposed on them because they would lose their way of life.

I come from another island, the island of Cape Breton, which has a fixed link. That fixed link is the Canso causeway which was built in 1953, about the time I was born. I do not really remember and have no direct experience of the debate which preceded the construction of the Canso causeway on Cape Breton Island and particularly the concerns there may have been at that time, that by creating a causeway linking Cape Breton to the mainland somehow we would cease to be an island.

The people on Cape Breton Island feel quite comfortably that they are islanders and they remain islanders even though the Canso causeway links them to the mainland. They certainly talk of themselves as living on an island. We have a song we call our national anthem which is called *The Island* and talks about Cape Breton as an island, a rock in the stream. It is very much a part of our culture 40 years after the construction of the Canso causeway.

I know as well that for the people in the communities of Cape Breton Island who find that their movements are limited because they have to cross bodies of water by ferry it is a major inconvenience. It slows their economy. It disrupts communication. I know those people, some of whom are in my riding since there are several ferries currently operating in my riding, are awfully anxious to have fixed links across those bodies of water.

I do not think we can say, certainly in the face of the overwhelming support that this project has on P.E.I., that because there is a link connecting P.E.I. to the mainland somehow that is going to mean that P.E.I. will cease to be an island. We have the example and the experience of Cape Breton Island to demonstrate the contrary.

I would like to close my remarks by returning to the question of whether this project has been adequately studied from an environmental point of view. When it comes to examining the environmental consequences of big projects of course one has to be thorough and try to see far into the future and examine these projects from a wide range of consequences.

We have to preserve and be mindful of concerns that perhaps many years ago we would have taken for granted, such as life on the bottom of the ocean, crustaceans, fish or the movement of natural habitat. All those things have to be given the same kind of priority as economic development.

There is a point at which one has to realize we cannot strive for certainty. There is always going to be an element of risk. There is always a balance that has to take place at the margin in assessing projects from an environmental perspective.

There was a concept which was current in discussing environmental analysis that was very often used to abort, prevent or paralyse real projects for which there was broad public concern. That term was called analysis paralysis. There is very often the risk that projects such as this will be subject to analysis paralysis. As a matter of fact when I think of the Canso causeway experience I wonder, if it was to be contemplated today, whether or not it would be built even though it is quite feasible technically. Would it have been delayed indefinitely because of analysis paralysis? We have to watch that it does not happen even though we want to make sure we are thorough and comprehensive in our environmental assessment.

• (1635)

We have a project here that has been thoroughly assessed and evaluated and has received the blessing of those whose future depends on it the most.

Hon. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton—Melville): Mr. Speaker, before you know it my friend from St. John's will want a fixed link from Newfoundland over to Prince Edward Island or something of that sort.

Mr. Crosbie: A fixed link to Saskatchewan.

Mr. Nystrom: Maybe he will want a fixed link over to the province of Saskatchewan.

I would like to say a few words about this issue as well. Bill C-110 is the proposal to build a bridge or fixed link from Prince Edward Island to the province of New Brunswick, something that has been talked about for many years off and on, going back to around the turn of the century.

Mr. Fulton: 1830.

Mr. Nystrom: 1830, almost 160-odd years. It is a long time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Fulton: Since John was a small boy.

Mr. Nystrom: I do not think the minister of fisheries was a member of Parliament in those days, or even around in those days. It was 1830, not 1930. That is a long time anyway.

In those days people were looking at the idea of replacing the ferry service with some kind of a fixed link, be it a bridge or tunnel. My recollection of the history of that period is there was a great debate as to what it should be.

Prince Edward Island did not join Confederation in 1867. It waited a few years until it had more negotiations with Ottawa. Part of the terms of union at that time was a guarantee in the Constitution of a transportation link between Prince Edward Island and the mainland.

Mr. Fulton: At no cost.

Mr. Nystrom: That was a provision to entice the people of Prince Edward Island into Canada.

The negotiations in those days for Confederation took place in Charlottetown. Despite the fact the negotiations were in Charlottetown, in a very historic building, Prince Edward Island did not join. One reason P.E.I. joined was to have this transportation service, not just for passengers but also for mail between the Islanders and the rest of the world, established on a daily basis between that province and New Brunswick guaranteed in the Constitution of Canada.

I hate to mention that *c* word again but it is the Constitution that guarantees this to the island. If we are going to be changing our ties with Prince Edward Island there eventually will have to be a constitutional amendment. I think that constitutional amendment now has been tabled in the legislature in Prince Edward Island—

Mr. Fulton: It will be debated tomorrow.

Mr. Nystrom: It will be debated tomorrow. It is not passed yet but it will be debated in the province of Prince Edward Island. We are going to have to look at the possibility of whether it should also be debated in New Brunswick. It also affects that province because that is were the ferry service goes.

Of course under section 43 of our Constitution it must also be debated and passed by the House of Commons and the Senate in a joint resolution. That is one thing that has to be done if this bill is to go through.

Another concern I have about the bill is that an assessment study is actually under way. That study has not been completed. It reminds me of the situation of the Rafferty–Alameda dam in my own province where construction of the dam was taking place before the assessment study had been completed by the federal and provincial governments. It is really putting the cart before the horse.

If the assessment study comes up and says we should not be proceeding because of reasons a, b, and c, then there is a tremendous waste of taxpayers' money that has gone into the preparations of the project, into some of the road-building for the project, some of the expropriation for the project and so on. Second, since the study is still going on and construction is under way there is tremendous pressure on the panel doing the study to come up with an approval for the project because if it does not there is once again a controversy over a waste of public funds that have already been expended.

• (1640)

I have seen that in my own province of Saskatchewan with the Rafferty–Alameda dam. It is not in my riding but is in the riding just south of mine. To this day it is still a very controversial project in Saskatchewan. The dam by the way is located in the riding of the former premier, Grant Devine, the Estevan riding. It was one of his pet projects and a deal that he made with the present Minister of the Environment.

It was interesting to note yesterday at the convention that one of the big cheerleaders for the Minister of the Environment was Grant Devine, the former premier of Saskatchewan. These are very interesting linkages and we are seeing again a replay of some of the things that happened at Rafferty–Alameda in Saskatchewan with the fixed link in New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island.

That is one concern I have about this project and it is one reason why we think it should not be going ahead at this time.

Second, I gather there is a court case that is still outstanding. It seems to me that before we pass a law in the highest court of the land, which is the Parliament of Canada, we should make sure that the court case has finished its course, that there is a judgment, that we have

that judgment before us and then we use the wisdom of the decision to guide the Parliament of Canada.

Once again we are putting the cart before the horse. We are making a decision on this bill before we hear from the court. Not only do we not have the completion of the assessment study, but we also have an incomplete judicial process in an outstanding court case.

I have already mentioned the third reason why I am concerned and that is the constitutional reason, the terms of union when Prince Edward Island became a province and the fact that if we are going to go in this direction there has to be a constitutional amendment under section 43 of the Constitution Act of Canada. Those are three of the concerns that I have.

A fourth concern is the massive government subsidy of a private developer. This fixed link, if it goes ahead, is going to cost the Canadian taxpayer some $42 million a year for 35 years. That is a lot of money which is going to be going from the pockets of the Canadian taxpayer to a private developer. I question the value of that in terms of an investment in a megaproject in a country that has a tremendous debt.

Under the Conservative government we have seen the debt go up from $150 billion–$160 billion to $458 billion. I question the wisdom of committing that $42 million a year for 35 years to a project that is capital intensive, that is not going to provide many jobs, that is going to cost taxpayers in Yorkton, Saskatchewan or Corner Brook, Newfoundland, or Sherbrooke, Quebec a lot of money over 35 years for a questionable return.

We have an obligation to the people of Prince Edward Island. That obligation is a ferry service that has been going very well, that has been very efficient and very effective over the years. Now we are taking a great leap into the unknown with a fixed link that possibly has environmental consequences in terms of ice, marine life; the environment in that very precious part of the world. It does not seem right that we should be going headlong into a decision to go ahead with this fixed link before we have the total, complete and full environmental assessment of what is going to happen to the environment in that part of the world.

I would like to see before we go ahead with this bill government members get up and justify why we would be rushing headlong into a project before the completion of a court case and before the completion of the environmental assessment study.

• (1645)

I refer once again to the Rafferty–Alameda dam that is being built and the millions of dollars that have been spent. It has a reservoir that may never be filled because of the drought and the dry conditions in southern Saskatchewan. It will have some dire environmental consequences for Saskatchewan and many of its communities for many years to come.

I close by saying, Mr. Speaker, if you were sitting here with me you would be up in the House saying the same thing I am today.

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to participate in this debate today and talk about some of the reservations we have about this particular project.

Regardless of what posterity may bring, we are rendering a service to the House and the Canadian people today by putting the arguments against this particular link.

I notice, as we have experienced a number of times in the House lately, the Liberal opposition and the government are as one on this as they were last week on telecommunications and as they were the week before on Bill C-106, an act to remove the last requirement for Canadian ownership under the Canada Lands.

An hon. member: Tweedle dum and tweedle dee.

Mr. Blaikie: They are as one when it comes to the free trade agreements and numerous other things. This is just an example but it is an example that stands by itself in a way and deserves particular attention as to why we in the NDP caucus feel we cannot support this particular link.

I might say that apart from the particulars—I am not an Islander and I am not from the maritimes—I do consider to be charged with having responsibility for all of Canada's environment as a member of Parliament. Whether I am on my feet here defending South Moresby and Lyell Island in the province of British Columbia,

prairie grasslands or the marine environment of Prince Edward Island, I feel it is appropriate for all members of Parliament to take an interest in this matter.

There is a pattern here which I have seen in other issues that in spite of all the rhetoric after the Bruntland commission and Brazil '92, the government is still not committed to full environmental assessment before a project begins. That is one of the most basic and simplest recommendations of anyone and everyone who is seen to know anything about how we should deal with the environment these days. We should not proceed with major megaprojects or other significant decisions until we have done our homework.

The list of megaprojects in the past that received no attention whatsoever and turned out to be disasters is too long to recite. Some have turned out to be okay and have been a great boon to their particular communities or regions while others have not. Now that we have some expertise—not perfect yet—in judging what the consequences of certain projects will be, we have an obligation to do everything we can to assess a specific project, not the generic project that has been studied inadequately but the actual project.

An hon. member: The specific.

Mr. Blaikie: The specific one. I understand this has not been done in this case. Therefore the concerns people have about ice, marine life et cetera have not been specifically addressed as far as this particular design or project is concerned.

• (1650)

The hon. member for Yorkton—Melville mentioned the Rafferty-Alameda where we had, from a global point of view in terms of Canada's reputation, the acutely embarrassing situation of the environmental review going on while the dam was being built. How absurd, Mr. Speaker. The Oldman River dam is another example. I am thinking particularly of another area in my home province where the government has not lived up to its responsibilities, and that is the matter of the Assiniboine River diversion.

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Blaikie: Other people and I are in possession of letters that were written by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans to the Manitoba government which point out inadequacies in the environmental assessment that has been done to date on the effects of the Assiniboine River diversion. They have had no impact on the provincial government in Manitoba. It seems committed to a kind of full steam ahead approach to this. The federal government, given its jurisdiction in the department of fisheries and perhaps through the involvement of the prairie farm rehabilitation administration should take its federal responsibilities seriously and make sure there is a full environmental assessment done of the Assiniboine River diversion project. But again this is not happening.

No wonder there is cynicism about the political process. Hundreds of people trek to Brazil to pat themselves on the backs about what a great job we have done on the environment here in Canada. We have references made, although we do not get them as often as we used to, about the Brundtland Commission and the need for sustainable development and the need to analyze everything as to how it will affect the environment. We have round tables on the environment and the economy and we have people flying every which way across the country destroying the ozone layer talking about the next great conference they are going to have on the environment.

When push comes to shove on a project like this or other projects, when all we ask is that a full environmental assessment be done and then let the chips fall where they may, we do not get it. Why is that, Mr. Speaker?

I see the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of the Environment is in the House. Maybe he could get up and enlighten us as to why this is the case, particularly with respect to this but also with respect to the Assiniboine River diversion, which happens to be in his home territory as well as mine, except that I am downstream from the effects of the project in a way that perhaps he is not.

Once again the government is not executing the environmental assessment process the way it should. It is being pushed through the House of Commons. I understand that the constitutional amendment that needs to go with this has not yet happened but there is an unseemly rush here. I know the people of Prince Edward Island have said yes. Of course it is not an easy thing for us to get up here and say no when they have said yes but many Islanders have said no. We felt a special responsibility to speak on their behalf today.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The question is on Motions Nos. 11 and 12. If Motion No. 11 carries it obviates the need for a vote on Motion No. 12.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

• (1655)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion the nays have it.

An hon. member: On division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Motion negatived on division.

Motion negatived.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The next question is on Motion No. 12. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on group three, Motions Nos. 30, 33 and 54.

Mr. Steve Butland (Sault Ste. Marie) moved:

Motion No. 30.

That Bill C-110 be amended in Clause 7 by adding immediately after line 34 at page 3 the following:

"(3) An agreement referred to in subsection (1) shall be laid before the House of Commons no later than the fifteenth sitting day of the House of Commons after it is made.

(4) An agreement referred to in subsection (3) shall come into force on the twentieth sitting day of the House of Commons after it has been laid before the House of Commons pursuant to that subsection unless, before that time, a motion for the consideration of the House of Commons to the effect that the agreement be annuled signed by not less than fifteen members of the House of Commons is filed with the Speaker of the House of Commons.

(5) Where a motion for the consideration of the House of Commons is filed as provided in subsection (4), the House of Commons shall, no later than the sixth sitting day of Parliament following the filing of the motion, take up and consider the motion.

(6) A motion taken up and considered in accordance with subsection (5) shall be debated without interruption for not more than three hours and, on the conclusion of such debate or at the expiration of the third such hour, the Speaker of the House of Commons shall forthwith, without further debate or amendment, put every question necessary for the disposition of the motion.

(7) If a motion described in subsection (4) is adopted by the House of Commons, the particular agreement to which the motion relates shall stand annuled."

Motion No. 33.

That Bill C-110 be amended in Clause 7 by adding immediately after line 34 at page 3 the following:

"(3) The Minister shall cause to be laid before each House of Parliament an agreement referred to in subsection (1) not later than the fifteenth sitting day of the House of Commons after it is made.

(4) An agreement laid before each House of Parliament pursuant to subsection (3) stands permanently referred to such committee as is established to review matters relating to public accounts."

Motion No. 54.

That Bill C-110 be amended by deleting Clause 7.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that those who have been following the debate on this bill on the fixed link, as we have affectionately or non-affectionately called it, sometimes wonder about the extent of the rhetoric. We have been off the topic on so many occasions and the name calling has been more prevalent than perhaps the substance of the debate.

I suspect that some of the amendments we put forward could be considered frivolous and perhaps even as a mover, my *raison d'etre* for putting them in there was to destroy the substance of the bill and the bill. But these amendments that are proffered now have substance and deal with the lack of substance in the bill. We were somewhat pleasantly surprised that the amendments brought forward were ruled in order because they do have considerable substance. They would serve to bring into the bill a great deal of accountability that is not present now.

I think I should refer to some of the details of the two amendments. I am told by counsel it is an either/or situation. The general concept of the either/or amendments is that once a deal has been struck between the government and the private developer, the details of the financial arrangements must be brought forward either to the House of Commons or before a committee. It is either brought to the House in full session with full debate—but we have been somewhat flexible in saying there be three hours maximum debate in the House—or referred to committee for debate of the details of the substance of the agreement between the private developer and the Government of Canada on behalf of the taxpayers of Canada. We feel that is not too onerous a task.

Once again time allocation has been invoked on this bill and people have said they have studied this bill to death and the studies will go from the floor to the ceiling.

• (1700)

I have a certain amount of sympathy for those who offer that argument. I agree there have been too many studies, but the ultimate study was never done. It is still not done. It is still before the courts and surely that must, or should, give all of us some concern.

A study was brought forward and people said they did not know if that was the ultimate study so we had better bring forth a study to study the study. We have done that *ad nauseam*, almost *ad infinitum*. The studies pile up.

The government commissioned a study but it did not like the results so we did not hear a great deal about that study. We had to pry the details of that study out of the government and we found out there were some environmental concerns and some socio-economic concerns. When we really got into a corner on this one it said that maybe the private developer should bring forth a study.

Much to everyone's amazement the private developer found out in its study that there really were no environmental concerns. All the fears were allayed. It said not to worry because this is a study that shows that its project would be acceptable to everyone.

This project, almost since time immemorial, has been studied to death, and the studies do pile up. We pit ice experts versus ice experts, theirs versus ours. It is like with economists. Take 10 economists in a room and five will say one thing and the other five will say just the opposite.

As for putting our ice experts against theirs, I want to say that our ice experts are those who deal in the area. We have been criticized by people saying: "You people do not go to P.E.I. You do not know anything about this". The people who have worked out there and know ice conditions say that the studies on the ice conditions were done in a year that had very minimal ice conditions. This is the year they should have done it.

Our experts are the experts who have gained their expertise from experience in the strait. We are not ashamed to proffer the studies of our experts versus theirs.

The bottom line is that this continues to a point, and I can understand, where people say enough is enough. However the fact that we piled the studies on top of one another, still have not finished the other studies and it is still in the courts means we did not do the job correctly. The government did not do its job.

It has been costly in every which way and it is controversial. Animosity has been created because of this but that does not make it right. That does mean that we can say it is okay now, do not worry, let us get it done in a couple of days because we all know the House is going to adjourn and we are going to have an election and so we will not worry about constitutional amendments or the environmental assessment review the government has put forward as something that must be done. The courts said this is what must be done but we are going to make do because of the faulty process this legislation has gone through.

Getting back to the substance of these particular amendments, they are not that onerous. They are just offering an opportunity to elected members to discuss the details of the financial arrangements struck by the private company, the private developer. I am not about to judge others but just in case it is not totally altruistic in its motives would it be too much to ask that this be debated here for three hours?

If that is too much to ask and members do not want the either, then take the or. The or is send it to committee so that the details of this arrangement can be brought forward. I am sure the details discussed at the committee will be brought forward for public debate.

• (1705)

It is a very narrow bill. So many substantial amendments have been ruled out of order that we said we had to accept the ruling but asked if we could be allowed a little more debate on these financial arrangements. It appears that the government really does not want to discuss those in public.

On a project of this size it is imperative that we get all of the details out so that 10 years down the road someone does not say: "Did we not know this might happen? Did you not know these were the arrangements between the private firm and the government? Did you not know that? Did anybody not care to ask at that particular time?"

This would make the implications of the legislation visible to everyone. I hope that the government will see fit to support the either or the or. That is the way it has to be, the either or the or. We have even given the government an option. So many others were ruled out of order but I appreciate the fact that these ones that have some consequence and some substance have been put forth for debate here. I hope that the government and the opposition will see fit to support the amendments.

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak today on Bill C-110, with regard to the provision of a fixed link between New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island.

This is a great historic event that is being put before the House because for over a hundred years members of Parliament from Prince Edward Island have come to the House of Commons and proposed that there be a fixed link, an all-weather highway or road joining Prince Edward Island to the mainland of New Brunswick. This has been done by such members as the hon. member for Egmont, who has spent a great deal of time here and has become an expert on issues such as this. He represents an agriculture-producing area and is very conscious of how important this would be for the production of agricultural commodities, especially potatoes but other products as well, in Prince Edward Island and how valuable this would be in terms of commerce, industry and so on.

There are a number of considerations with this bill. There is the whole question of the cost, the question of the Constitution and the commitment that was made when Confederation brought Prince Edward Island into the union. That commitment has to be kept. There is the whole question of the environment, which has been studied. I am told there have been at least 92 different studies on the impact of this fixed link. Both the Government of Prince Edward Island and the Government of New Brunswick, which have the primary responsibility for matters of the environment, have indicated their support for the proposal.

Most of all there is the question of the economy of the Island. Clearly no area of our country has suffered more, outside of northern Ontario, than Atlantic Canada. At no time has it suffered more than in the last eight or nine years as a result of the very oppressive fiscal and monetary policy under which we have had some 38 new taxes imposed. We have had a monetary policy that has put our interest rates at almost twice those in the United States at a time when we are trying to sell commodities to the United States.

Clearly we are supporting it because it is the one action the government has made. It will provide construction during the next five years and a commitment of funding.

• (1710)

Of course we are supporting it. The hon. minister of fisheries is supporting it too. He did not do very well over the weekend but he is supporting this project. His power has slipped since 1983.

We on this side are very proud of the new premier of Prince Edward Island, Miss Catherine Callbeck, who was a member of Parliament for Malpeque until a few months ago. She has taken the initiative in the Prince Edward Island legislature to bring in an amendment to the Constitution which changes, as I understand the arrangement, the term steamship to fixed link. We do not even use steamships for the ferry service now. We use diesel powered craft. Clearly those are technical matters that have to be cleared away. I understand that things are moving along very well in that regard.

I am surprised that the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie is opposing this project because for those living in an area like Sault Ste. Marie, Algoma, Prince Edward Island or any part of the maritimes the great problem is to get the Government of Canada to go ahead and carry out the necessary public work. That is exactly what this is. It is a public work to replace the existing steamships or diesel ferries that provide the service.

In Sault Ste. Marie we have had a long-standing problem for many years because the Sault Ste. Marie ship canal broke down. A serious flaw developed in the structure and we have been fighting for five or six years to get the Government of Canada to carry out the necessary repairs. It is a project that only involves some $13 million or $14 million. Compare that amount to this project.

I do not know why the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie would oppose this project. Clearly it is in the interests of Prince Edward Island. There are not many New Democrats there but they are Canadian citizens. They have three Liberal members. There will be another one after the next general election because Mr. Wayne Easter, the former head of the National Farmers' Union, was nominated just last week. He will probably replace Catherine Callbeck, who has become the premier of the province.

There are so many reasons why the government and the NDP in the House should be supporting this project. In 1988 when there was a general referendum on the question some 60 per cent supported it and 40 per cent opposed it. That should be very instructive to NDP members and anybody else concerned about this issue. A recent survey carried out by the CBC shows that the percentage in favour has increased from 60 per cent to 70 per cent. Now only 30 per cent oppose it. That should impress anybody.

The member for Sault Ste. Marie has made a number of motions concerning reports to Parliament and so on. It seems to me that any kind of funding that will be required will have to come out of the estimates of the Department of Public Works. Therefore there will be rigorous scrutiny of any money that is expended by the federal government either in the spending estimates or in the supplementary estimates that are put before the House.

We should really be moving with this project. Beyond the historical responsibility of the Government of Canada the whole question of modern day commerce and the movement of goods, services and people is clearly important.

• (1715)

It is important because Prince Edward Island is really a very special place in terms of culture and television. The whole *Anne of Green Gables* television series I am told is just as popular in Japan as it is in Canada. Clearly when we are inviting people from all over the world to come and visit the Island then we certainly should be providing modern transportation services for them.

There is another matter and that is just the magnitude of employment that this will provide over a five-year period. The member for Egmont or any of the members from Prince Edward Island or New Brunswick will say that employment will be essential. It will be very important to the new government elected this year to be able to provide that employment over the next five-year period.

I think on all of those counts that the long standing historical demand and need for this, the demand for modern commerce and communication, the employment involved and the fact that the environmental demands have been met make it a project which should go forward. I hope that the NDP will not hold it up any more, that the bill will be passed today and that it will get third reading by tomorrow because I think it is a project which should go forward.

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to speak on the amendments by my colleague from Sault Ste. Marie. I would not be surprised if this government turned those intelligent public scrutiny amendments down, which would allow the House to have a look at the costs being levied on the people of Prince Edward Island and the people of Canada by SCI. I would not be surprised if the government wanted to hide that away. I would not be surprised if the Liberals wanted it hidden away as well.

We are certainly hearing from environmental groups all over this country who are keeping a close eye on this debate because they all recognize now that even in opposition the Liberals will not stand up for an environmental assessment of a project.

We know that Paul Martin, Marlene Catterall and these Liberals who pretend to always be standing up for the environment—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The hon. member knows that one does not name the person by their name but by their riding.

I just do not understand why when the hon. member for Skeena gets up there is so much noise here. The hon. member for Skeena has the floor. Debate.

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Speaker, many calls have been coming to my office not only from national environmental organizations that are watching the Liberals act as Conservatives as they are wont to do, but there are also many calls coming from Prince Edward Island from Islanders who are pleased. Contrary to what we are hearing from the Liberals from Prince Edward Island who only want things said in favour of the project, they are worried that some of the things about this project that deserve public scrutiny might actually get public scrutiny and reveal the Liberals for the scallywags that they really are. They are the tail on the end of the Tory dog. People in the maritimes have long known that.

The taxpayers have long wanted to know what the truth is about the $1.47 billion. I would like to quote from *The Globe and Mail* from an article written by Stevie Cameron called:

> Taxpayers to pay all of P.E.I. bridge bill. 'Private' project stirs control fears.
>
> The controversial bridge to Prince Edward Island, although billed as a private project, will be entirely paid for by Canadian taxpayers.

Remember that this is *The Globe and Mail*. We know how close the Liberals and Tories are to *The Globe and Mail* so this is as if it comes from the Scriptures for them:

> Strait Crossing Inc., the Calgary-based company that won the bridge contract, will receive enough government subsidies every year to pay the entire costs of the interest and principal on its loans for the $800 million project.
>
> The federal government has guaranteed the project, even if the project is stalled or the bridge has to close for any reason, according to a confidential offering memorandum prepared for potential investors.
>
> "What I can't understand is why this is being termed a private enterprise project," said Donald Deacon, former head of F. H. Deacon Hodgson, a Toronto investment firm and former head of the Atlantic Provinces Economic Council.
>
> Mr. Deacon, now a P.E.I. resident, has been outspoken in opposition to the project.
>
> "This is no different" he said "than if the government put the project out to tender and owned it itself—except here they are giving SCI the rights to the profits for the next 35 years and giving them control of the operations".
>
> The memorandum, prepared by Gordon Capital Corp., underwriters for the bridge financing, shows that the federal government will pay an annual subsidy of $42 million for 35 years to cover all the costs of the bonds being issued to pay for the bridge. The subsidy will rise or fall with inflation or deflation.

• (1720)

Let us keep it clear. It is 35 years and $42 million in fixed 1992 dollars. So when we say it is $1.47 billion, if inflation runs at even a couple of percentage points we will be up over $2 billion in no time at all.

> (Ownership of the bridge reverts to the federal government after 35 years.)

The document shows that SCI has been guaranteed a minimum rate of return on toll revenues for the next 35 years. The company is also allowed to raise tolls annually by up to 75 per cent of the increase in the consumer price index.

One would have thought today that the Liberals who call themselves the Official Opposition might have been raising questions, just a few questions. Why is it that the specific bridge proposal by SCI has never been subjected to an environmental assessment?

An hon. member: It has.

Mr. Fulton: Oh? Some Liberals like to say that it has. It has not been subjected to an environmental assessment. The generic bridge proposal was and it was turned down. Under Canadian law the generic bridge proposal came before a panel that looked at these famous 1992 studies and gave it thumbs down. The Minister of Public Works hand picked four "ice experts" who did another study and figured out that some other kind of bridge might be able to do it. However, their study was never peer

reviewed. It never went back before the panel and it has never seen the light of day. Ever since then we have seen increasingly toxic levels of scurrilous activity by the government benches along with the incestuous relationship with their friends in the Liberal Party.

I have to wonder why the Liberals are so nervous of this? The people in Prince Edward Island are going to have to pay an unknown level of tolls. Premier Callbeck has not told the people of P.E.I. what it is going to be. SCI has not told them what it is going to be. The fisheries minister has not told them what it is going to be. It is the big secret for the election campaign.

We can be sure that it is going to be a gouge because I have tracked the activities of SCI. We hear a lot of clatter and chatter from the Liberals. Let us think about what kind of representation they have from British Columbia. None. Zero. There is not a single active member of Parliament. It is the most important province in the country.

Let us carry on and see what else *The Globe and Mail* had to say about this great Liberal-Conservative deal and why they are conspiring to keep the people of Prince Edward Island from knowing the truth about the project. Let me quote again:

> Ronald Lloyd, an official with Gordon Capital who has been working on the financing deal for several years, explained that the deal was complicated and involved several layers of financing.
>
> "The government originally proposed a $37 million annual subsidy but increased it to give the developers cash up front".

Well, thank you to the Tories. They pump it up so that their friends with SCI can get some cash up front. Well, is that not that nice?

What do they say after that?

> "We had to create a security to amortize the stream of government payments to create something for the developers up front. No institutional investor in his right mind will take the contractor's credit for that 35-year period, so we had to take something to match the government payments and gave cash proceeds up front for the construction".
>
> Marine Atlantic gets an annual subsidy of about $22 million to run the ferries and many people have asked why the subsidy is being almost doubled for SCI, especially when the subsidy to Marine Atlantic has been declining since 1989.
>
> "No one has ever been able to show how the $42 million is related to avoidable costs of the ferries," said Mark Freiman.
>
> "At a time when the government is talking of cutting the deficit it is going to increase it because there are no revenues going to the taxpayers. SCI gets all the profits on this project."

• (1725)

Here the tables are turned. The Liberal's official policy in opposition—we can expect it in government—is that no megaproject will get an environmental assessment or review. That is what the Liberals are saying.

In my riding I know why. Between 1980 and 1984 the Liberal environment minister of the day, Mr. Marchand, gave the largest mining company in the world, Amax, the right to dump 100 million tonnes of toxic tailings into the Pacific fishing grounds. The Liberals fought for years to ever let that information come public. Finally British Columbians joined by Canadians from coast to coast to coast stopped the project.

I predict that this is precisely what the court will ultimately do on the fixed link. What is being done is not constitutionally proper. Madam Justice Barbara Reed earlier this year made an order affecting the Minister of Transport and the Minister of the Environment which has not been lived up to.

I put the question before the House again. Why is there this sudden rush? The P.E.I. legislature did not until the end of last week put its constitutional amendments before its House. It has not been debated and it certainly has not been passed. It will not even be dealt with until tomorrow. There is nothing before this House to deal with the Constitution in relation to the obligations of Canada to Prince Edward Island in terms of the 1873 union. Why is that so hush hush around here? There is no environmental assessment of the specific project.

What about the lobsters? What about the scallops? The fisheries minister has diligently and dutifully listened to this debate. Why is it that the concerns of the Atlantic fishermen that have been raised time and time again publicly in opposing this project have never been dealt with? We could lose fisheries worth hundreds of millions of dollars and thousands of jobs. As we can see from these studies waved around earlier by the Liberal House leader there will be a net loss of jobs from the fixed link.

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency): Mr. Speaker, before the hon. member for Ottawa Centre speaks I might just put a few facts on the record. I know he is too astute and intelligent to be misled by the hon. member who just ceased speaking.

Just to make sure that is the case just let me put a few facts on the record. First the tolls; the moustache that tolls. That is what I often think when I listen to the hon. gentleman who just sat down. As the NDP goes down in the polls their voices go up in this Chamber. Since there are not going to be any of them here after the next election I suppose we should listen to them with some fondness and that includes the hon. gentleman who just sat down.

Let us just deal with the tolls first. The developer will only pocket any toll revenues after an independent review has confirmed that maintenance and repairs have been carried out on the bridge. The tolls for the bridge are to be comparable to the tolls for the ferries that are operating there now and comparable to the tolls during the last year of operation of the ferries. I would much sooner pay the toll to use a bridge that I can cross at any time of the day or night than have to wait for a ferry. I would must sooner pay a comparable toll to do that than pay a toll on the ferry.

Over the next 35 years the tolls will not be allowed to increase by more than three-quarters of the consumer price index. It is a control on what increases there can be with reference to the tolls.

Mr. Milliken: He said that in his speech but he made it sound a lot bigger.

Mr. Crosbie: I do not think he understood what he was saying anyway. He just wanted to come in here and make sure that he was heard. The hon. gentleman has said that he is not going to attempt to be re-elected. He was very wise. The aboriginal people in his district have told me that they are going to make sure that he does not get re-elected in any event. He has been smart enough to take a hint and he is not going to offer again. We are going to miss him.

• (1730)

When we look at the past trends in the ferry tolls, and I do not think that the hon. gentleman opposite has looked at them because he just wants to toll on about the ferries, it is clear they have increased at a rate higher than inflation which they will not be able to do in the future.

The federal NDP members in this House and their one unelected counterpart in P.E.I., who at the present time is on the public payroll—

Ms. Hunter: What about the unelected Senate?

Mr. Crosbie: There is no gender bias in the NDP ranks. One is just as loud as the other no matter what gender they are. The only opposition to this project is coming from the NDP.

The subsidy on this operation is not to exceed $42 million in 1992 dollars. How is it calculated? It represents the projected costs of the Borden-Tormentine ferry service over the next 35 years, including capital expenditures which are not covered by the annual subsidy that Marine Atlantic gets today. If the ferry system is left in operation there will have to be new ferries.

Even the NDP expert in economics, and I am not sure who that is because as far as I am concerned the New Democrats do not have an expert in economics but somebody has that name, said that this was fairly credible given that the ferries will have to be replaced. We have to replace ferries when they wear out.

That $42 million is going to be the sum of the direct operating subsidy to Marine Atlantic. It covers the administrative overhead of Marine Atlantic, the replacement of vessels, the costs of refitting the old ferry boats, and the capital cost of the land-based facilities that have to be there such as the docks and transfer bridges on both sides of the ferry crossing. Then there are some additional expenditures on highway improvements, compensation to ferry workers and some administrative and overhead costs of Public Works Canada.

If we do not build the bridge then the Government of Canada will still have to continue spending $42 million a year, not just over the next 35 years but forever. If the bridge is built we are going to get a bridge in good operating condition after we make just 35 payments of $42 million each.

If one had the slightest iota, jot or tittle of common sense one would consider this and support the project. Why is it that the New Democratic Party persists with nonsensical approaches in a practical everyday world? The people of Prince Edward Island are going to be very much further ahead in terms of economics and ease of transportation if this fixed link is built. However all the

NDP does is oppose this project on the ethereal grounds that it has not been studied from an environmental point of view. There have been dozens of studies.

Ms. Hunter: You guys introduced environmental assessment. Why don't you respect it?

Mr. Crosbie: We respect it. That is our problem.

Somebody mentioned we should not be proceeding because something is in the courts. There is not anything today that is not in the courts because people of the persuasion of the NDP are constantly in the courts. When they cannot win the battle of public opinion or they cannot win the battle with the public then they go to the courts. It is an environmental study. Whenever we open our mouths the NDP wants an environmental study done. I do not know what its excuse is.

It is in power in Ontario. Is it doing environmental studies before it takes any actions at all in Ontario? Of course not. Is it doing it in Saskatchewan? Of course not. It changed its position on uranium in Saskatchewan because it is in power in Saskatchewan. If it ever got into power here it would be changing its position on all these points as well. As for the deficit, there would be nothing crueler or colder than the NDP cutting the deficit if it ever got into power federally. However I do not want to get diverted.

All it is doing is attempting to save Upper Canada the odd dollar that will be spent on this bridge. I had to laugh at the hon. members opposite quoting *The Globe and Mail* editorial. If we followed *The Globe and Mail* editorials there would be a wasteland in Atlantic Canada.

• (1735)

We would not have the Hibernia project. We would not have a bridge to P.E.I. We would not have a thing in Atlantic Canada if we listened to *The Globe and Mail*. I am surprised and shocked that the hon. gentlemen who comes from a remote area in British Columbia would quote *The Globe and Mail* approvingly on this subject.

An editorial that appeared in the Charlottetown *Guardian* on May 13 in reaction to an article in *The Globe and Mail* said this:

> Never mind that the modernization of Atlantic Canada's antiquated transportation web is a fundamental prerequisite to the modernization of this region's economy, never mind that the crossing project will bring an essential boost of activity to the Maritimes, never mind that the fixed crossing is a worth-while experiment in private sector financing and construction of public projects. As far as *The Globe* is concerned, a dollar spent on Atlantic Canadian infrastructure is nothing more than an Upper Canadian tax dollar that could be better used elsewhere.

I am shocked. All that the hon. gentleman opposite wants to do is save his upper Canadian tax dollars that could be spent to improve transportation and infrastructure in Atlantic Canada.

I do not want to take too much time to go into every facet of this.

Mr. Blaikie: Carry on John, carry on.

Mr. Crosbie: If the member wants me to carry on I can help him in that respect too.

Just think of the greater efficiency that there will be for every industry in P.E.I. that is sensitive to the effectiveness of the transportation system. Tourists who want to go to P.E.I. will not have to line up all summer to get on the ferries. They will just get in their cars and drive across the bridge. It is estimated that there will be a permanent 25 per cent increase in visitors to P.E.I. once the fixed link is completed.

I am running out time so I do not have the time to paint all the pluses and the attractions of this project. Seventy per cent of the $850 million required for this project is to be spent in Atlantic Canada. There will be 3,500 person-years of employment and several hundred million dollars of industrial purchases within Atlantic Canada over the next five years. All this will help to reactivate the economy down there and the NDP is up here struggling against this project rather than putting this bill through the House unanimously. It is a shameful performance and I ask New Democrats to come to their senses and let us move on to other subjects that are controversial and not the fixed link.

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker, first let me congratulate the government for putting forward this bold legislation before the House to deal with a question of great importance to my colleagues on this side of the House.

I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the MPs from Prince Edward Island who have been working tirelessly over the past four and a half years pressing for action on this issue before the end of this Parliament. The fact that the bill is before us is due to the tireless work of many members of Parliament who want to see economic development taking place in this great part of Canada, Prince Edward Island and Atlantic Canada as a whole.

Since Confederation this country has been built on give and take. As the hon. minister indicated earlier, from time to time it is the responsibility of the federal government to step in and encourage regional economic development for the sake of the country as a whole. Even if we put that aside what we are seeing in Canada now is something that we have never seen for generations, and that is a tremendous amount of migration from Atlantic Canada and rural Canada into the urban centres of Canada.

One of the main reasons why this great amount of migration is taking place is the lack of jobs and opportunities. Not too long ago I travelled with my colleague from Nepean throughout Canada in order to listen to what the municipalities and provinces had to tell us about the state of infrastructure in those provinces and municipalities.

One of the issues that came to our attention over and over again was that there is a tremendous need for federal government involvement in the area of infrastructure. We issued a report at the time and we have pressed the government for action on the question of infrastructure. The government has not taken any action to address the question of infrastructure across Canada. One has to give credit where it belongs. When it comes to the question of links between New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island we have before us now a proposal that would address part of the infrastructure question with which we must deal.

• (1740)

This proposal would put an excess of $800 million into Atlantic Canada. Over 75 per cent of the $800 million would be spent on contractual work, material work, labour and so on. It will directly benefit Atlantic Canada and in particular Prince Edward Island.

We are not giving a handout to the provinces. We are doing what we should be doing as a federal government under Confederation. We have a responsibility to invest in different parts of the country in order to maintain what this country is all about. This is about jobs.

Not too long ago the Prime Minister was recorded in *Hansard* of June 1993, in an answer to a member from the New Democratic Party. He said: "In that case he would be interested in the following statement today that the leader of Prince Edward Island NDP or neo-Democrat is quitting his job for three months and collecting unemployment insurance to save the NDP money".

An hon. member: Shame.

Mr. Harb: That is exactly what some hon. members said, "shame", and some others said, "oh, oh". The Prime Minister went on to say: "The leader, I use euphemistically, of the NDP Larry Deschenes, aged 44, says the self-imposed lay-off will save the NDP about $4,000 from his annual salary".

That is what has been happening in P.E.I. When one gets to a point where even the leader of the NDP has to go on unemployment insurance in order to save his party job, one would say that when an opportunity like this is brought before the House of Commons in order to create jobs the first group of people who should be jumping to their feet to support it should be those in the NDP.

I want to say that there is in excess of $20 million on annual basis that will go to P.E.I. and New Brunswick in order to help them with the maintenance of the highway at both ends of the tunnel. That is an investment in infrastructure.

The New Democrats have been trying over and over again to press the government for action on infrastructure. Here they have it. Let us stand up and vote for this legislation so we can help the people who need it the most. There is no question that from 1867 until now there have been discussions on a regular basis between the federal government and the provinces, and in particular the Atlantic provinces, in order to help out in every possible way so we can build a better Canada, a more economic Canada and a more vital Atlantic Canada. We can try to reverse the migration from rural Canada, Atlantic Canada into the big centres. Hopefully we will be able to reverse that by helping them out in areas where they were born or raised in so we can build a better Canada.

I want to again congratulate my colleagues from Prince Edward Island. I would like to congratulate the government for putting forward this proposal at this time. We will be voting for it unlike the NDP. We will not be speaking from both sides of our mouth. We will be speaking from one side to say that infrastructure is a needed investment in Canada and it is time to move on with it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): It being 5.45 o'clock p.m., pursuant to order made earlier this day, in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 78(3), it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the report stage of the bill now before the House.

The question is on group 3, Motions Nos. 30, 33 and 54. Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

Some hon. members: All those opposed will please say nay?

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

• (1745)

The first question is on Motion No. 12.

Call in the members.

The House divided on the motion, which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 534)

YEAS

Members

Benjamin
Brewin
Fulton
Hunter
Stupich—9

Blaikie
Butland
Heap
McLaughlin

NAYS

Members

Andre
Baker
Bernier
Bevilacqua
Bjornson
Blais
Bosley
Brightwell
Cadieux
Catterall
Champagne (Champlain)
Chrétien
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clifford
Collins
Corbeil
Côté
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Darling
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dingwall
Domm
Duplessis
Epp
Feltham
Ferland
Fontaine
Friesen
Greene
Guarnieri
Harb
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hockin
Horner
Hughes
James
Jourdenais
Koury
Langlois
Layton
Lee
Littlechild
MacAulay
Maheu
Martin (Lincoln)
Mayer
McCreath
McGuire
Mifflin
Monteith
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Phinney
Porter
Redway
Reimer
Rideout
Roy-Arcelin
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Siddon
Sobeski
Speller
Tardif
Thompson
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vincent
Wenman
Wilbee
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Winegard
Young (Acadie—Bathurst)—145

Attewell
Belsher
Bertrand
Bird
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Boudria
Browes
Campbell (South West Nova)
Chadwick
Chartrand
Clancy
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Danis
DeBlois
Della Noce
Dick
Dobbie
Dorin
Edwards
Fee
Ferguson
Flis
Foster
Gagliano
Grey (Beaver River)
Halliday
Harvard
Hawkes
Holtmann
Horning
Jacques
Joncas
Kempling
Landry
Larrivée
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lewis
Loiselle
MacKay
Malone
Masse
Mazankowski
McDougall (St. Paul's)
McLean
Milliken
Moore
Oberle
Ouellet
Pickard
Proud
Reid
Ricard
Rompkey
Schneider
Shields
Simmons
Soetens
Stevenson
Thacker
Thorkelson
Tremblay (Lotbinière)
Van De Walle
Vien
Weiner
White
Worthy

PAIRED MEMBERS

nil/aucun

• (1810)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I declare the motion lost.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gagliano: Mr. Speaker, I think you will find there is unanimous consent for the vote just taken to be applied to all amendments and for the same vote to be applied in reverse to the motion for concurrence at the report stage.

[*English*]

Miss Grey: Mr. Speaker, I would go along with that. I would like my vote recorded as a nay at concurrence stage.

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, if I understand correctly, the recommendation is that the vote that was just taken apply to all the amendments and in reverse at concurrence. If that is the case, then we concur as well.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The House divided on Motion No. 30, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 535*)

YEAS

Members

Benjamin
Brewin
Fulton
Hunter
Stupich—9

Blaikie
Butland
Heap
McLaughlin

NAYS

Members

Andre
Baker
Bernier
Bevilacqua
Bjornson
Blais
Bosley
Brightwell
Cadieux
Catterall
Champagne (Champlain)
Chrétien
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clifford
Collins
Corbeil
Côté
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Darling
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dingwall
Domm
Duplessis
Epp
Feltham
Ferland
Fontaine
Friesen
Greene
Guarnieri
Harb
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hockin
Horner
Hughes
James
Jourdenais
Koury
Langlois
Layton
Lee
Littlechild
MacAulay
Maheu
Martin (Lincoln)
Mayer
McCreath
McGuire
Mifflin
Monteith
Nicholson
Ouellet
Pickard
Proud
Reid
Ricard
Rompkey
Schneider
Shields
Simmons
Soetens
Stevenson
Thacker
Thorkelson
Tremblay (Lotbinière)
Van De Walle
Vien
Weiner
White
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Winegard
Young (Acadie—Bathurst)—145

Attewell
Belsher
Bertrand
Bird
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Boudria
Browes
Campbell (South West Nova)
Chadwick
Chartrand
Clancy
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Danis
DeBlois
Della Noce
Dick
Dobbie
Dorin
Edwards
Fee
Ferguson
Flis
Foster
Gagliano
Grey (Beaver River)
Halliday
Harvard
Hawkes
Holtmann
Horning
Jacques
Joncas
Kempling
Landry
Larrivée
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lewis
Loiselle
MacKay
Malone
Masse
Mazankowski
McDougall (St. Paul's)
McLean
Milliken
Moore
OberleO'Kurley
Phinney
Porter
Redway
Reimer
Rideout
Roy-Arcelin
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Siddon
Sobeski
Speller
Tardif
Thompson
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vincent
Wenman
Wilbee
Worthy

PAIRED MEMBERS

nil/aucun

The House divided on Motion No. 33, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 536*)

YEAS

Members

Benjamin
Brewin
Fulton
Hunter
Stupich—9

Blaikie
Butland
Heap
McLaughlin

NAYS

Members

Andre
Baker
Bernier
Bevilacqua
Bjornson
Blais
Bosley
Brightwell
Cadieux
Catterall
Champagne (Champlain)
Chrétien
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clifford
Collins
Corbeil
Côté
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Darling
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dingwall
Domm
Duplessis
Epp
Feltham
Ferland
Fontaine
Friesen
Greene
Guarnieri
Harb
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hockin
Horner
Hughes
James
Jourdenais
Koury
Langlois
Layton
Lee
Littlechild
MacAulay
Maheu
Martin (Lincoln)
Mayer
McCreath
McGuire
Mifflin
Monteith
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Phinney
Porter
Redway
Reimer
Rideout
Roy-Arcelin
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Siddon
Sobeski
Speller
Tardif
Thompson
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vincent
Wenman
Wilbee
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Winegard
Young (Acadie—Bathurst)—145

Attewell
Belsher
Bertrand
Bird
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Boudria
Browes
Campbell (South West Nova)
Chadwick
Chartrand
Clancy
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Danis
DeBlois
Della Noce
Dick
Dobbie
Dorin
Edwards
Fee
Ferguson
Flis
Foster
Gagliano
Grey (Beaver River)
Halliday
Harvard
Hawkes
Holtmann
Horning
Jacques
Joncas
Kempling
Landry
Larrivée
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lewis
Loiselle
MacKay
Malone
Masse
Mazankowski
McDougall (St. Paul's)
McLean
Milliken
Moore
Oberle
Ouellet
Pickard
Proud
Reid
Ricard
Rompkey
Schneider
Shields
Simmons
Soetens
Stevenson
Thacker
Thorkelson
Tremblay (Lotbinière)
Van De Walle
Vien
Weiner
White
Worthy

PAIRED MEMBERS

nil/aucun

The House divided on Motion No. 54, which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 537)

YEAS

Members

Benjamin
Brewin
Fulton
Hunter
Stupich—9

Blaikie
Butland
Heap
McLaughlin

NAYS

Members

Andre
Baker
Bernier
Bevilacqua
Bjornson
Blais
Bosley
Brightwell
Cadieux
Catterall
Champagne (Champlain)
Chrétien
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clifford
Collins
Corbeil
Côté
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Darling
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dingwall
Domm
Duplessis
Epp
Feltham
Ferland
Fontaine
Friesen
Greene
Guarnieri
Harb
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hockin
Horner
Hughes
James
Jourdenais
Koury
Langlois
Layton
Lee
Littlechild
MacAulay
Maheu
Martin (Lincoln)
Mayer
McCreath
McGuire
Mifflin
Monteith
Nicholson

Attewell
Belsher
Bertrand
Bird
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Boudria
Browes
Campbell (South West Nova)
Chadwick
Chartrand
Clancy
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Danis
DeBlois
Della Noce
Dick
Dobbie
Dorin
Edwards
Fee
Ferguson
Flis
Foster
Gagliano
Grey (Beaver River)
Halliday
Harvard
Hawkes
Holtmann
Horning
Jacques
Joncas
Kempling
Landry
Larrivée
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lewis
Loiselle
MacKay
Malone
Masse
Mazankowski
McDougall (St. Paul's)
McLean
Milliken
Moore
Oberle

O'Kurley
Phinney
Porter
Redway
Reimer
Rideout
Roy-Arcelin
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Siddon
Sobeski
Speller
Tardif
Thompson
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vincent
Wenman
Wilbee
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Winegard
Young (Acadie—Bathurst)—145

Ouellet
Pickard
Proud
Reid
Ricard
Rompkey
Schneider
Shields
Simmons
Soetens
Stevenson
Thacker
Thorkelson
Tremblay (Lotbinière)
Van De Walle
Vien
Weiner
White
Worthy

PAIRED MEMBERS

nil/aucun

Hon. Elmer M. MacKay (Minister of Public Works) moved that the bill, as amended, be concurred in.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 538*)

YEAS

Members

Andre
Baker
Bernier
Bevilacqua
Bjornson
Blais
Bosley
Brightwell
Cadieux
Catterall
Champagne (Champlain)
Chrétien
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clifford
Collins
Corbeil
Côté
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Darling
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dingwall
Domm
Duplessis
Epp
Feltham
Ferland
Fontaine
Friesen
Greene
Halliday
Harvard
Hawkes
Holtmann
Horning
Jacques
Joncas
Kempling
Landry
Larrivée
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lewis
Loiselle
MacKay
Malone
Masse

Attewell
Belsher
Bertrand
Bird
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Boudria
Browes
Campbell (South West Nova)
Chadwick
Chartrand
Clancy
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Danis
DeBlois
Della Noce
Dick
Dobbie
Dorin
Edwards
Fee
Ferguson
Flis
Foster
Gagliano
Guarnieri
Harb
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hockin
Horner
Hughes
James
Jourdenais
Koury
Langlois
Layton
Lee
Littlechild
MacAulay
Maheu
Martin (Lincoln)
Mayer

Mazankowski
McDougall (St. Paul's)
McLean
Milliken
Moore
Oberle
Ouellet
Pickard
Proud
Reid
Ricard
Rompkey
Schneider
Shields
Simmons
Soetens
Stevenson
Thacker
Thorkelson
Tremblay (Lotbinière)
Van De Walle
Vien
Weiner
White
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Winegard
Young (Acadie—Bathurst)—144

McCreath
McGuire
Mifflin
Monteith
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Phinney
Porter
Redway
Reimer
Rideout
Roy-Arcelin
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Siddon
Sobeski
Speller
Tardif
Thompson
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vincent
Wenman
Wilbee
Worthy

NAYS

Members

Benjamin
Brewin
Fulton
Heap
McLaughlin

Blaikie
Butland
Grey (Beaver River)
Hunter
Stupich—10

PAIRED MEMBERS

nil/aucun

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

STEEL INDUSTRY

Mr. Steve Butland (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, I am rising to ask for some elaboration from the government on a question I asked on June 1 this month with regard to the steel industry. My question was for the Minister for International Trade. He was not in the House that day. It had to do with the most recent ruling by the Canadian international trade tribunal that had suggested, as the Canadian steel industry believes, the multi countries were in fact dumping steel products into

Canada. The CITT saw fit to suggest that despite margins of up to 130 per cent dumping was found—

• (1815)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order, please. We are on the adjournment motion and we cannot hear. Would you go behind the curtain, *s'il vous plaît*. Thank you.

Mr. Butland: I appreciate your intervention, Mr. Speaker. It was somewhat difficult to carry on.

As I suggested, the Canadian international tribunal should be applying Canadian trade law that protects the Canadian steel industry. The Canadian steel producers are suggesting that American trade law is much more onerous. It is there to protect the American steel industry whereas the Canadian trade law as applied by the Canadian International Trade Tribunal is there to uphold the law rather than protect the industry.

In a perfect world we think that perhaps our system is the better system but the Americans insist on treating us unfairly as they are wont to do and have continuously done for quite a long period of time, definitely since the signing of the free trade agreement. Trade harassment has actually increased as opposed to having decreased.

I suppose the government is going to respond by suggesting that the minister has met with the steel producers and it is going to monitor very much more closely than it has done in the past the dumping process by many countries. The one that gave us the greatest concern was the United States of America which on a regular basis recently has harassed the Canadian steel industry.

All we are looking for is this level playing field that is so often touted for all of us, but we do not feel that the field is level whatsoever. All we are looking for is the fair and equitable treatment from our American neighbours that we are affording them.

No amount of monitoring by the steel industry, by the trade minister or his department will change the efficacy of American trade law and the lack of efficacy of Canadian trade law.

I hope that the member responding on behalf of the government will give us more assurances. If trade law has to be changed to deal with our American counterparts, so be it. It is not the perfect solution. It is not even the appropriate solution but it is the only solution that we can proffer and is acceptable to Canadian steel producers. I suggest we go forward with it.

Mr. Lee Clark (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, to respond briefly to my hon. friend's question I want to note that first of all the Minister of Finance and the Minister for International Trade did meet with representatives of the steel industry just recently and discussed the concerns which the industry had and which my hon. friend has been raising in the House. They also discussed the options which may be available to that industry and to the government working in co-operation with the industry.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, but I think it important nevertheless to remind Canadians, the government of course had no part in the decisions to which my hon. friend refers. The Canadian International Trade Tribunal is an independent body and the decisions of that tribunal are the final steps in what might be described as a quasi-judicial process.

As a result of that if the industry believes that the tribunal was wrong in either of the decisions then it does of course have recourse to appeal either before the Federal Court of Canada or under the FTA, chapter 19.

This government understands the industry's concern. We understand that it may indeed feel vulnerable to dumped imports in the future. We are prepared to work with the industry in ensuring that it is adequately protected should imports increase in the future.

With respect to the industry's concerns with the differences in Canadian and U.S. trade remedy law we acknowledge that there may be such differences and we are prepared to look at them. These differences, however, are not at the heart of the problems faced in the Canadian steel industry. We feel that some of those differences will be eliminated if the multilateral trade negotiations are concluded.

• (1820)

JOB START PROGRAM

Mr. J. W. Bud Bird (Fredericton—York—Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, I want to continue with a question I directed some time ago to the minister responsible for employment and immigration with respect to the Job

Start program which exists in the town of Oromocto, New Brunswick in my constituency.

This is a unique approach to job training in the sense that it creates an employment scenario and actually hires disadvantaged youth under the age of 24 who have been on welfare for more than one year or have been without work for more than one year. It puts them in a disciplined job environment where they are literally hired as employees.

This program had its origin in 1984 in the United Nations year of Youth which Canada had adopted. The town of Oromocto at that time took the initiative, patterned on programs which existed at the time in Winnipeg, Montreal and Halifax, to design this unique Job Start program that contained the best of those existing programs and added some additional features. They have had a remarkable record over the years to the extent that of all the student employees, as they are called, who have graduated from that program in the past five years, 74 per cent remain employed.

That is a statistic and an accountability record that is missing in so many of the job training and employment programs that exist in Canada. This factor of accountability does not seem to be a tracking that occurs with these other programs so it is hard perhaps to measure the value that is achieved in comparison. It is one of the features that demonstrates the cost effectiveness of this program where the CEIC contribution is used to maintain training staff, to pay the student employees on a minimum wage basis over a 24-week period and to subject them to all of the disciplines of employment, including punctuality and dress codes. They receive driver's licence training, CPR training and first-aid training. Many of them are advanced to the completion of their high school education requirements. At the end of the 24-week period they graduate from the employment scenario and are placed in the work place where they have this remarkable record of 74 per cent employment.

One of the criticisms has been that because they are employed at the minimum wage and deductions are made for unemployment insurance and workmen's compensation, there is a potential that these training programs will result in students who are also on unemployment eligibility after they finish the training program. This has to be a risk that is accepted for the value of the job discipline scenario. The statistical record of the success of the program demonstrates that the risk is really very low. The 74 per cent employment factor over such a period of five years is a rationalization of the risk of the cost of the program and the manner in which it is applied.

My question and my recommendation to CEIC is you have supported the Job Start program and the Job Start design in Oromocto, New Brunswick, this one community, for several years now. Each year there are two classes or job training programs of 24 weeks duration, each involving an average of 22 students. The success rate has been remarkable. Why is this program not taken and expanded elsewhere in Canada and made a permanent component of the Canadian Jobs Strategy program design or a unique option in the very comprehensive training structure which we have at work in Canada at this time?

Mr. Lee Clark (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, first of all let me say to my hon. friend that the department does indeed agree that the Job Start program to which he refers has been successful. Because of that success the program has been approved to continue for another year with a budget of some $346,000.

• (1825)

The key answer to my hon. friend's question is that the department is most anxious to ensure the criteria for such programs remain fluid and flexible. It is understood that the job retraining requirements throughout Canada are very much in a state of flux. What is required this year will not necessarily be the case next year and it has been an ongoing process.

For that reason therefore the department prefers that the criteria and operations of the federal employment program remain sufficiently flexible so that the needs of the individuals it serves can be addressed.

I remind my hon. friend that training programs similar to the Job Start program may well be initiated and continue to be initiated in other areas under the project-based training component of the employability improvement program. I hope he will find some consolation in that.

In closing I encourage my hon. friend to ensure that success stories of this kind are brought to the department's attention. Very often the department fails to hear

of the program successes and therefore does not receive the encouragement it often deserves.

MULTICULTURALISM

Hon. Alan Redway (Don Valley East): Mr. Speaker, you will recall some three months ago Mrs. Mary Marko Haskett visited Parliament Hill. Mrs. Haskett was born in Canada some 84 years ago. In 1915 at the age of six, Mrs. Haskett and her family were arrested and sent to an internment camp in northern Quebec called Spirit Lake.

Spirit Lake of course is no longer on any map of Canada. Mrs. Haskett was one of some 5,000 Canadians of Ukrainian origin who were rounded up and interned because they came from parts of Ukraine that at the time were controlled by the Austro-Hungarian empire, an empire with which Canada and its World War I allies were at war.

Although some 5,000 Canadians were treated in this fashion, there is no mention of it whatsoever in the history books of Canada. As far as Canadian history is concerned this never happened. There is no record of Spirit Lake or any other camps such as this ever existing.

When Mrs. Haskett came here for her visit it reminded me of a talk I had with another of my constituents who told me about the experiences of his father. His father, who was a Canadian with origins in the Austro-Hungarian empire, came to Canada before World War I. He too was arrested and interned.

This man had little formal education but he was hard working and had earned some money. He did not trust the banks. He decided to save his money. He put it into gold and not the bank. When he was interned he took his gold with him. Of course the guards at the internment camp said that he could not go into the camp with the gold and that if he gave it to them he would be given a receipt so he could claim it later, if he ever got out.

After World War I my constituent's father gave his receipt to the guards who took the receipt and went to get the gold. They came back saying that there was no gold. That did not happen just to one person, it happened to many people in World War I.

The son of this man, my constituent, investigated what had happened to his father's earnings, possessions and gold. He found that the Bank of Canada had been keeping these things in trust for many years, not just for his father but for other Canadians.

Of course the Bank of Canada said on presenting the receipt he would be given the money with interest. Of course the guards took the receipt. The Bank of Canada said that was too bad and it would just have to sit on that money, letting it accumulate for the benefit of who knows whom. That happened not just to one person but to a great many Canadians.

I think it is understandable that my constituent, as the beneficiary of his father's estate, would expect to get his money back. I think it is understandable that Mrs. Haskett in coming to Parliament Hill wanted an apology, wanted the fact that she and 5,000 other Canadians like her actually should be recorded in Canadian history. There should be something in the history books of Canada about the fact that these events took place.

It is not an isolated incident. In fact the Prime Minister drew attention to that when he spoke on November 4, 1990 to the National Congress of Italian-Canadians. My friend the parliamentary secretary was there at that time.

At that time the Prime Minister said: "I want to discuss a particularly sad chapter in our history that directly affected some of you here today and that concerns all Canadians. I am speaking, of course, about the harassment and the internment of Canadians of Italian origin under the War Measures Act during World War II. It was not an isolated case, in fact it was part of a pattern of discrimination practised by the Government of Canada over a period of years against Chinese Canadians, Ukrainian Canadians and others. That Canadians were interned unjustly must never be forgotten", said the Prime Minister. "It is a matter of simple justice. It is in that spirit that we will proceed."

The Prime Minister went on in that address on November 4, 1990 to say, and I quote: "I am pleased to announce today that during this session of Parliament I will rise in the House of Commons and extend a formal apology to all members of the Italian community for this unspeakable act and to other Canadians who have suffered similar grievances".

Mr. Speaker, I do not have to tell you that the life of this Parliament is drawing to an end. Need I say more?

Mr. Vincent Della Noce (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State of Canada and Minister of Multiculturalism and Citizenship): Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate my friend for bringing to my attention and the attention of the House this important issue.

The hon. member for Don Valley East has again raised the important question of community redress. He will know that I have a very special interest in this issue which I have been working on for about six or seven years.

He is totally right in what he just said about this Parliament and the Prime Minister. I was there and I heard it with my own ears. I heard about those Italians. Some of those poor internees must be 86 years old by now. Mr. Serafino from Ottawa and Mr. Capograno from Montreal heard those words, those apologies. I wish that every community could have heard this man say this. I quote Mr. Serafino: "It sounded like music to my ears. I wish my wife was alive and here with me to hear these words".

At the request of the Prime Minister, the Minister of Multiculturalism and Citizenship met with representatives of communities whose members have concerns about treatment of some of their members by past governments of this country. By the way, on June 10 of last week it was 53 years since those things happened to my community and nothing has been done about it. The minister discussed how the government could best symbolize recognition of this treatment.

The principal groups with whom the minister met included the Chinese Canadian National Council, the National Congress of Chinese Canadians, the National Congress of Italian Canadians and the Ukrainian Canadian Congress.

I would like to point out that this is the first government to give serious consideration to this matter. I say as a personal comment that I have been pursuing this matter since 1986. I feel that this government, our government, will be willing to take that kind of action and it is the only one that can do it, but I hope it can do it fast enough.

The government has discussed a fair and reasonable package with the communities concerned. The government has said it will move ahead if the package receives broad support across the communities concerned.

I know that some communities are playing politics on this issue. I hope they stop that because in 53 years there was nothing done about this.

[*Translation*]

When the government makes a proposal for community redress, it must also ensure that the decision is fair and equitable for all Canadians. The issue is not only about recognizing certain facts of our history but also deciding how we intend to progress as a nation founded on the principles of justice, equality and respect for all.

That is the firm commitment the Government of Canada has made, and that is why it is doing everything it can to deal with this question in the appropriate manner, and I hope that our government will succeed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Therefore, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

The House adjourned at 6.34 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, June 15, 1993

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Charles A. Langlois (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and to Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 22 petitions.

[*Editor's Note: See today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

* * *

[*English*]

FAIR TRADE AND BENEFICIAL INVESTMENT ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

Mr. Steve Butland (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, I am happy and proud to present a bill in the name of the hon. member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca. It is entitled the fair trade and beneficial investment act. It amends the Special Import Measures Act so that the Canadian International Trade Tribunal can investigate whether the lack of enforced internationally recognized standards on labour, environment and human rights comprise a hidden subsidy to products imported into Canada. When CITT finds such a case it can slap these products with a countervailing tariff that is equal to the value of the hidden subsidy.

Second, it amends the Investment Canada Act to allow Canada to amend the performance requirements for foreign investment in Canada and lower the investment review threshold down to $10 million.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order, please. The hon. member will need unanimous consent of the House to move for leave to introduce a bill on behalf of Mr. Barrett.

Is there unanimous consent of the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Agreed and so ordered.

Mr. Butland: Since I have finished, Mr. Speaker, I hope what I previously said will be accepted. I appreciate the consent from the members.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Mr. Butland for Mr. Barrett moves for leave to introduce Bill C–457, an act to prevent unfair competition in trade and to amend the Special Import Measures Act and the Investment Canada Act in consequence thereof.

Pursuant to Standing Order 68(2), the motion is deemed adopted.

Mr. Butland for Mr. Barrett moves that the bill be now read the first time and printed.

Pursuant to Standing Order 69(1), the motion is deemed adopted.

Bill read the first time and printed.

* * *

PETITIONS

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Ms. Lynn Hunter (Saanich—Gulf Islands): Mr. Speaker, it is my duty and privilege to present a petition under Standing Order 36.

As many of us know there are a number of people in our country who oppose the concept of two official languages and who believe the decision was made without consulting the people of Canada.

Sixty petitioners from my district, in particular Sidney, B.C., ask Parliament to enact legislation providing for a referendum of the people binding upon Parliament to

accept or reject two official languages, English and French, for the government and people of Canada.

The acceptance or rejection of the proposed amendments is to be determined by a majority vote of the total votes cast in the whole of Canada together with the majority vote in the majority of provinces, with the territories being given the status of one province.

UKRAINIAN CANADIANS

Mrs. Louise Feltham (Wild Rose): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 I have two duly certified petitions to present on behalf of the people of Wild Rose.

In the first petition from the Banff area the petitioners seek to settle a claim for acknowledgement and redress for injustices committed to the Urkrainian Canadian community during World War I.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mrs. Louise Feltham (Wild Rose): The second petition has been signed by constituents in my riding who are asking that the Government of Canada hold a referendum to accept or reject the entrenchment in the Constitution of two official languages.

WHARFS

Mr. Fred J. Mifflin (Bonavista—Trinity—Conception): Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to Standing Order 36 to present a petition from 465 constituents essentially from the Bonavista area and Bayleys Cove.

These petitioners represent families who have been involved in the fishery for generations. I know some of them personally. I know this is a very well intended and serious petition.

• (1015)

The petition essentially centres around a federal government wharf historically maintained in good order in the Bayleys Cove area of Bonavista for the use of the many fishermen in the area and in other areas as well.

Essentially the point they make is that the distance from the main harbour is such that this wharf is used in emergencies many times. It has also been used historically by all the people in the area.

The problem is that during the winter of 1992-93 the wharf was damaged by both rough seas and severe icing conditions. In addition, there is not much wharfage for small boats in Bonavista. It is one of the main fishing ports in Newfoundland.

The petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to urge the government, particularly the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, to immediately effect repairs to this wharf so as to enable the many fisherpersons in the area to have facilities that are convenient and necessary to ensure safety.

PEACE TRUST FUND

Mr. Ray Funk (Prince Albert—Churchill River): Mr. Speaker, it is my honour to present three petitions to the House signed by 800 Canadians from 23 communities including Toronto and Ottawa in Ontario, Port Alberni, Parksville, Castlegar, Crescent Valley in B.C., as well as Winnipeg, Saskatoon and other communities.

The petitioners call on Parliament to establish a peace trust fund which would allow Canadian taxpayers who for reasons of conscience and religion choose to redirect a portion of their taxes paid to the government away from military uses and to the fund to be used, if so directed, for peace, education, research, humanitarian aid and other purposes.

This is the subject matter of a private member's bill. As a response to that bill, which is going to die on the Order Paper, I pledge myself to these petitioners that if I make it back the peace trust fund bill will be back as well.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Hon. Ralph Ferguson (Lambton—Middlesex): Mr. Speaker, I rise under Standing Order 36 to present a petition in the House of Commons. The petition is from the undersigned residents of Canada who avail themselves of the ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to the petitioners and with a certain assurance that the honourable House will therefore provide a remedy.

There are 29 names on this petition, 27 of them from my constituency and the other 2 from the constituency of Sarnia—Lambton.

SERIAL KILLER BOARD GAME

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to present a petition which is concerned about the serial killer board game.

This petition represents a great many other petitioners who signed petitions which were not formerly acceptable to Parliament. These 25 names represent several hundreds of names that were collected by Miss Donna Neufeld in my riding. I would like to congratulate her for the work she has done in this regard.

The petition calls on Parliament to amend the Criminal Code of Canada so that violent and degrading materials such as the serial killer board game can be kept from being distributed in Canada.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I would also like to present a petition which concerns itself with the preservation of medicare and reform of the health care system.

It calls on Parliament to take into account the following matters: reaffirmation of a commitment to a comprehensive national health care program; discontinuation of current freezes and reductions in the funding formula; development of new agreements to consultation and negotiation with the provinces; reaffirmation of a commitment to the guarantees in the Canada Health Act; withdrawal of Bill C–91 which gives brand name drugs a 20–year market monopoly; provisions for the production of low priced generic substitutions of brand name pharmaceuticals marketed in Canada; compensation to provincial pharmacare plans for rising drug costs; reaffirmation of a major federal responsibility for health protection and promotion; development of a national co–ordinated approach to health care reform; recognition that health care reform requires remedying the structural, social and economic inequalities which are at the root of inequalities in health status; and recognition that the preservation of medicare and any changes to our health care system must be achieved through public awareness, open consultation and citizen participation.

CHRISTINE LAMONT AND DAVID SPENCER

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I have another petition which calls upon Parliament to urge the Secretary of State for External Affairs to request the Government of Brazil to expel Christine Lamont and David Spencer and return them to Canada.

This is an ongoing concern of many members of Parliament. Many people feel it is long overdue for the Government of Canada to request the expulsion of these two Canadians and have them returned home.

• (1020)

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona): Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition signed by some 31 constituents of mine. They humbly pray and call upon Parliament to enact legislation providing for a referendum of the people binding upon Parliament to accept or reject two official languages, English and French, for the government and the people of Canada.

They also call for legislation providing for the acceptance or rejection of the proposed amendments to be determined by a majority vote of the total votes cast in the whole of Canada, together with a majority vote in a majority of provinces with the territories being given the status of one province.

Mr. David D. Stupich (Nanaimo—Cowichan): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition I am submitting on behalf of the member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca signed by residents of his riding on the question of bilingualism.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Charles A. Langlois (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and to Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, Questions Nos. 387 and 460 will be answered today.

[*Text*]

Question No. 387—**Mr. Mifflin:**

With respect to the 1990 Atlantic Fisheries Adjustment Program, (a) what is the breakdown of the $584 million of moneys spent to date (b) how much of this fund is remaining and how is it planned to be spent?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency): The Atlantic Fisheries Adjustment Program, AFAP, provides for the expenditure of $584 million over five years ending on March 31, 1995. The program containing a package of policy and program initiatives is delivered through several federal agencies. The follow-

ing breakdown reports on the financial status of AFAP initiatives by agency.

Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO) $ million

Total budget allocation	356.0
Total planned five-year expenditures and commitments as of March 31, 1993	341.6
Balance of program funds available	14.4

Over the remaining years of the program, DFO intends to target its program efforts to ensuring adjustment in the processing industry, encouraging professionalization in the groundfish fishery and economic diversification in Atlantic Canada. Efforts will focus on the means to achieve effective conservation such as through gear selectivity, further enforcement and protection measures, and optimization of the effectiveness of the current enforcement system.

Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency (ACOA)

Total budget allocation	90.0 million
Total five-year expenditures and commitments as of April 30, 1993	62.3 million
Uncommited balance	27.7 million

ACOA efforts under the Fisheries Alternatives Program will focus on supporting eligible projects and activities proposed by the private sector which will promote economic diversification of expansion in fishery dependent areas of Atlantic Canada.

Department of External Affairs and International Trade (EAITC)

Total budget allocation	1.6 million
Total five-year expenditures and commitments as of March 31, 1993	1.6 million
Uncommitted Balance	0.0 million

The AFAP funding provided to EAITC has been used to supplement over a five-year period the department's efforts to enhance international marketing and trade in Canadian underutilized and value added fish and seafood products. Efforts are continuing as planned.

Industry, Science and Technology Canada (ISTC)

Total budget allocation	6.4 million
Total five-year expenditures and commitments as of March 31, 1993	6.4 million
Uncommitted balance	0.0 million

The seafood and marine products sector campaign, an ISTC initiative, has been partially funded from AFAP. The campaign, a multiyear national initiative, is designed as a joint effort with industry to improve the long run international competitiveness of the Canadian fish processing sector. The initiative is proceeding as per plan and within the established budget.

Employment and Immigration Commission Canada (EIC)

Total budget allocation	120.0 million
Total five-year expenditures and commitments as of October 1, 1992	95.5 million
Uncommitted balance	24.5 million

Financial commitments under the community development fund will proceed as planned for the remaining years of the program. CEIC will also respond as required to requests from affected individuals in the fisheries sector for adjustment services and other program benefits.

Labour Canada

Total budget allocation	10.0 million
Total five-year expenditures and commitments as of March 31, 1993	2.8 million
Uncommitted balance	7.2 million

Labour Canada, through the Program for Older Worker Adjustment, POWA, provided income assistance to fish plant workers affected by designated lay-offs as a result of the downturn of the Atlantic fisheries. POWA was used as an interim financial assistance vehicle until the announcement of the Plant Workers Adjustment Program in May 1990. While POWA remains available, no further demands on the program are anticipated.

Question No. 460—**Mr. Hovdebo:**

What were the names of the funds deregistered from the Immigrant Investor program of the Department of Employment and Immigration, who were the principals behind each fund and what were the reasons for each deregistration?

Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Employment and Immigration): There have been three suspensions of marketing approval under the Immigrant Investor program.

St. Jude Inc., a 5.1 million maximum fund, was suspended for misleading advertising placed by overseas sales agents. This problem was resolved and the suspension was removed. St. Jude is controlled by Mr. J.B. McCullough of Hamilton, Ontario.

Giant Bay B.C. Fund Inc. and Giant Bay Investment Fund Inc., both $20 million maximum funds under the Immigrant Investor program, were suspended during their marketing periods because a related fund, International Capital Corporation, ICC, a Saskatchewan offering, was found not to be in compliance with investment rules under the Immigrant Investor program. Both the Giant Bay fund and ICC are controlled by Mr. Reginald C. Schafer of Saskatoon, Saskatchewan. ICC itself has not been suspended because the problems giving rise to the Giant Bay suspensions were discovered after the close of the marketing period for ICC.

Violations of Immigrant Investor program regulations or guidelines discovered beyond the normally permitted 18 month marketing period are dealt with by means other than suspension of approval or deregistration. In the ICC case, the matter was referred to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, who, following investigation, laid charges alleging fraud under the Criminal Code. These charges are now before the courts.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Langlois: Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The questions enumerated by the hon. parliamentary secretary have been answered. Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

NORTHUMBERLAND STRAIT CROSSING ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

Hon. Elmer M. MacKay (Minister of Public Works) moved that Bill C-110, an act respecting the Northumberland Strait Crossing, be read the third time and passed.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is time to get on with the job of building a bridge to Prince Edward Island. Bill C-110, an important part of that process, is being considered for third reading. I am very proud to speak in support of the legislation.

Some members will recall perhaps not directly that about 30 years ago there was an important initiative to build a link to Prince Edward Island. In fact certain preparatory work was done. At that time, to put things in perspective, it was decided by the then government to trade off the funds and instead indulge in or promote a comprehensive economic development plan for the island province.

This economic development plan has done a lot of good. Perhaps at this time the very growth it engendered makes it even more important we proceed with this link in order to take advantage of the potential for economic development that exists.

This is the most far-reaching and important project I believe Public Works has been associated with in many years. As a resident of Atlantic Canada I am very proud to be part of the project which will benefit Atlantic Canadians, people from Prince Edward Island and indeed all Canadians long after those of us who are in the House have passed from the scene and have been forgotten.

This project has the support of a clear majority of people from Prince Edward Island. Polls indicate that. A recent CBC poll taken earlier this year showed 63 per cent in favour. I suggest that any government in the democratic world that had that kind of popular support would think itself very fortunate.

This project initiated by the private sector and by our government has the continuing and constructive support of both past and present Governments of Prince Edward

Island, the Government of New Brunswick and the Government of Nova Scotia. The Northumberland bridge project stands as a prime example of how governments in the country can work together for the greater public good.

Business organizations and most Atlantic unions have been very vocal in support of the project. Other voices that have been raised in opposition in the House have been quite muted, perhaps not in volume but in number, and mostly confined to members of the NDP.

This party, it is worth noting for the record, has never elected a member in Prince Edward Island, ever, and probably never will. It enjoys the support of about 3 per cent or 4 per cent of the electorate, to the point where even the leader of the NDP of Prince Edward Island has found it necessary to take a summer job to save his party money, he says, but unfortunately it comes from the UI fund. This is not a good example, I would suggest, of some of the financial savings they keep urging on the people of Canada at the expense of the link.

• (1025)

These naysayers have suggested the government will inherit a rusting and decaying structure at the end of 35 years. In fact the bridge will have a design life of 100 years without a major refit. During the 35-year concession period, annual independent inspections of the bridge will have to confirm the necessary maintenance and repairs have been carried out before the developer can receive toll revenues. This is a very strong incentive, all members will agree, for the developers to build it right and to maintain it in good working order during the period of their stewardship.

The NDP has said that the proposed $42 million annual subsidy was too high. In fact its own witness at the all-party legislative committee examining the bill admitted the figure which was carefully worked out by Transport Canada was "fairly credible, given that the ferries are going to have to be replaced". Several of the ferries will have to be replaced. It is evident today the cost of replacing a modern ferry is going to be several hundreds of millions of dollars. Somehow this is never brought into the equation by the members from British Columbia who are speaking on behalf of the NDP.

My good friend from Skeena, and he is a good friend, in some of the more lofty flights of rhetoric he indulged in when speaking on the bill, said the following on February 8 when talking about what they do in British Columbia. Isn't this terrific? He said: "There we try to make tourists and passengers happy while they are waiting for the ferry. We sell them a hot dog, give them a cup of coffee, let them buy some local goods, have a few people playing guitars, give them newspapers and have a little fun". I like this.

I invite my friend from Skeena some cold, rainy day to come to Prince Edward Island to see a bunch of outraged truckers and business people waiting to get across to do business. He will see how many will be made happy by some hot dog purveying, guitar strumming coffee merchants. He can tell them this is what they should be happy for instead of having a bridge.

My good friend, and he is also a good friend, from Annapolis Valley—Hants gave a speech the other day. He indicated that he thought it would be more to the point to connect Vancouver Island to the mainland than Prince Edward Island to Canada. I am not against that. If the private sector can come along with a good scheme that would not cost the taxpayers money, I would applaud it, but I remind my good friend there is no constitutional obligation, unfortunately perhaps, to make sure that Vancouver Island is put in the same position as Prince Edward Island. He knows that.

For those who argue that this is a risk-free enterprise for the developer under the agreement, that is not true. The developer will assume most of the risk for the project, including financial, design, construction, maintenance and cost overruns.

Mr. Fulton: None.

Mr. MacKay: My friend says: "None". If it were none the Auditor General would insist it be booked as an expense of the Government of Canada. It is the developer's risk.

He also said it as if there were some sin in foreign investment coming in and owning part of it. So what? This is a private sector initiative, one that is good for Atlantic Canada and good for Canada. As well, if this bridge is not ready on time, it will have to be financed by the operators. All kinds of safeguards are in place.

This head in the sand attitude toward an endeavour which is widely popular with both the people and governments concerned helps explain in part why—and my friend and I have talked about this jokingly—the NDP has about 4 per cent or 5 per cent of the popular vote in Prince Edward Island and is unlikely to change that in the near future. It is a non-existent party in all of

Atlantic Canada. This is part of the reason for this back to the future attitude it has.

The project's economic benefits both short term and long term make a powerful case for moving ahead with all speed. In the shorter term the cost of constructing the bridge will be about $850 million, representing a stimulus to the Canadian economy in the order of $1.3 billion. The project will create between 3,500 and 4,000 person-years of employment over the five-year construction period. Almost all of it will come from the Atlantic region and will contribute about $450 million to the region's economy.

An estimated 70 per cent of the purchasing of goods and services will be done within Atlantic Canada and more than 80 per cent within Canada as a whole, which in itself makes it a rather exceptional project of this magnitude for this part of Canada.

• (1030)

Building a bridge will provide a much-needed shot in the arm for the Atlantic Canadian economy. However the main benefits will be those occurring year after year once the structure is in place and the transportation arteries are unblocked. Then the people of Prince Edward Island can build and develop the potential of this magnificent island province which is now stunted.

It is no coincidence that the unemployment rate, as my friend from Prince Edward Island will agree, is higher than the unemployment rates in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick simply because an important tool of economic development is not being utilized.

Long-term economic benefits include an increase of about 25 per cent in annual tourist traffic. Many members in the House may not be aware that when this bridge is built there will still be a perfectly adequate ferry service to Prince Edward Island operated by the private sector, Northumberland Ferries Limited, which does a fine job. Next week it is putting a new vessel in service. About $15 million of improvements have been made to the docks of that ferry service despite the impression left that the government has somehow been starving the existing ferry service for modern facilities.

Prince Edward Island's agricultural and fisheries industries will see a major reduction in costs for transporting their products as well as greater certainty of delivery.

The P.E.I. Trucking Industry Commission has estimated annual savings of $10 million a year as a result of the bridge. The utility operators such as the electric power and telephone companies will save from the permanent utility corridor which is part and parcel of this bridge. The list goes on.

Suffice it to say, the completion of the fixed link will have a positive and lasting effect, an economic benefit on the economic opportunities for the people of one of Canada's poorest provinces. These benefits will ripple out to all the Atlantic region and to Canada as a whole.

Much has been made by opponents of the project concerning the possible environmental impact of such a major engineering undertaking. The proposed bridge has been subjected to the most thorough environmental assessment of any such project ever undertaken in the country. It was the member for Cape Breton—East Richmond yesterday who dealt extensively with this point. I believe he tabled a list of the literally dozens of studies that have been made in connection with the link to Prince Edward Island. It has also been the object of the most comprehensive public consultation program, with some 64 public meetings held on both sides of Northumberland Strait.

There are those who will never be convinced. I think the member for Egmont, when he spoke in February, made reference to this fact when he quoted Cathy Edward, one of those who had been charged with giving an objective assessment of the project. She has been quoted, and I believe accurately because my friend would not quote inaccurately, as saying:

> We can do something about ice. It is called mitigation. I doubt that there are mitigating measures for the heart. The heart has its own reasons.

There is nothing wrong with the heart having its own reasons. There is nothing wrong with being philosophically opposed to a link, any link, to Prince Edward Island. However to clothe this sentimental attachment in some kind of specious argument based on economics is intel-

lectually dishonest and I think we should all keep this in mind.

Public Works Canada has carried out or commissioned over 90 studies relating to environmental assessment and project feasibility. Most recently, in response to a Federal Court order, the proponent, Strait Crossing Incorporated, prepared a specific environmental evaluation of its bridge proposal. Subsequently my department held public meetings and set up a toll-free telephone line to facilitate receiving advice from the public.

The specific environmental evaluation was carefully scrutinized by my department and many others. I reviewed SCI's proposal, the report of the independent ice specialists, the expert advice from other federal departments and agencies, and the comments received from the public. On May 13 I concluded the potential environmental effects that may be caused by the proposal were either insignificant or mitigable with known technology. The more this is studied, the more evident this becomes.

• (1035)

I am currently reviewing any further public comment that may be received. I will be announcing in the near future whether the project should be referred to a public review by a panel. After all this the opponents of the project still claim that we have not complied with the process and have initiated yet another court challenge. This matter is now before the judiciary.

I am all for open and full debate. I also firmly believe that the major public concern must take precedence over the narrower views of single interest groups which have been so vociferously put forward in particular by the NDP.

Bill C-110 is an important element in the over-all project in that it spells out the financial terms and conditions under which the project will operate. The arguments have been made. While I realize the rules of relevance are interpreted widely here, members' speeches have not focused on this simple enabling statute which is part of the process. This bill ensures that neither future federal governments nor the Canadian taxpayer will be subjected to undue or unsuspected costs.

The subsidy of $42 million annually has been carefully worked out by Transport Canada and represents the sum of direct costs paid to Marine Atlantic, such as the administrative overhead, the replacement of vessels, and the refitting of boats in land based facilities.

Again going back into the future, the sixties as the NDP would like us to do, it is worth noting with respect to Marine Atlantic that there was an effort made to build a bridge or a causeway at that time. Suddenly the subsidies for Marine Atlantic and the service seemed to improve, things got a bit better, but once the project was shelved and a comprehensive economic development plan was put in place Marine Atlantic subsidies began to climb. This is a matter of record and can easily be ascertained if anyone cares to check.

When the bridge is built the federal government will get an $850 million bridge in good operating condition after 35 years. At that time there will be many options available as to what is to be done but it will be owned by the Crown. I suspect many of us in 35 years will have only an academic interest in what the government of the day will decide what is best.

Mr. Nowlan: I will still be here.

Mr. MacKay: I will be here if the hon. member for Annapolis Valley—Hants is here. We will make a wager.

Mr. Nowlan: With Anne of Green Gables.

Mr. MacKay: This will be the span of green gables. If the bridge is not built the government will have to continue spending $42 million a year in the foreseeable future. I would not say in perpetuity because that is a long time, but the government will have to pay for a long time. It does not take a rocket scientist to see which option is a better deal for the Canadian taxpayer.

The agreement stipulates that over the first 35 years the developer may not increase tolls by more than three-quarters of the Consumer Price Index. This means that over time the relative cost to users of the bridge will steadily diminish.

By enshrining these and other terms and conditions into legislation we will provide clear guidelines to the developer of his responsibilities and restraints. We will ensure that future governments have the tools to keep federal expenditures to a minimum.

As I have said this project represents one of the finest examples of positive, constructive federal–provincial co–operation. It has been a pleasure for the Conservative administration to work with the private sector and with the Liberal governments of Atlantic Canada. There is tremendous co–operation and a feeling that we are doing something positive for a region of Canada that really needs this kind of stimulus. More important it needs an upgrade and improvement of its transportation system.

Everyone, and I believe that includes my good friends in the NDP, have said from time to time that transportation is an integral part of economic development. Without good economic development there is no hope for the future, particularly those regions that do not have some of the natural advantages that exist in certain more favoured parts of our country.

I want to thank and congratulate the former premier of Prince Edward Island, Mr. Joe Ghiz. I wish to express my gratitude to P.E.I. Premier Catherine Callbeck and New Brunswick Premier Frank McKenna for their support of this initiative and their willingness to work with us in sorting out the details of such a huge and complex undertaking.

• (1040)

I remind members of the House that Bill C–110 is only one element of this project. There are other elements, constitutional and financial, that are still under consideration. However without this piece of legislation the project lacks a certain security and the developers would not be permitted to raise funds and get on with the job when the other matters are sorted out.

As the House knows, we have achieved a comprehensive tripartite federal–provincial agreement covering a whole range of key areas including environmental soundings, fishermen's compensation, tolls, the fair treatment of ferry workers who are affected and so on. I am confident this agreement will enable us to proceed in the same spirit of harmony and co–operation we have seen to date.

Last week the Government of Prince Edward Island introduced a motion in the province's legislature which in effect stated that a toll bridge was an acceptable way for the federal government to meet its constitutional commitment to keep Prince Edward Island in continuous communication with the rest of Canada. Perhaps it would be more accurate, for the benefit of my friend from Egmont, to say to keep the rest of Canada in continuous communication with Prince Edward Island. Either way it is important.

I propose that we introduce a similar resolution in the House later this year and thus clear away any remaining constitutional impediments to terminating the Borden–Tormentine ferry service, keeping in mind there will still be a perfectly adequate ferry service between Wood Islands and Caribou.

It is worth putting on record some of the words of Premier Callbeck of Prince Edward Island when she spoke on this matter last week in her provincial legislature. She said the following when she was talking about the government's goal of economic self–reliance and self–determination, something that is very important to the people of Atlantic Canada and particularly to the Government of Prince Edward Island at this time when it is faced with high budgetary deficits and needs every bit of help possible to develop its economy. She said:

> Transportation is an integral part of this equation. No longer will we be subjected to an intermittent transportation service; no longer will we be subjected to transportation uncertainties; no longer will we be subjected to divisive and protracted debate; and no longer will we be subjected to unfettered toll increases. In tandem with Canada and SCI we are embarking upon self–determination and self–reliance in our transportation link to the mainland in a responsible and business–like manner.
>
> The time for protracted debate is over; the time for action and decision is now. Let the project proceed.

That is what Premier Callbeck of Prince Edward Island had to say. It is important that we pass this legislation now and bring that bridge one step closer to reality. This is a good project and a sound project. It is a project that is a partnership. I highly recommend it to my colleagues in the House of Commons.

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to put a few questions to the minister on this important bill.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): There is no unanimous consent.

Under Standing Order 74 the first two speakers have 40 minutes without questions or comments and then speakers have 20 minutes with questions and comments.

Mr. Fred J. Mifflin (Bonavista—Trinity—Conception): Mr. Speaker, I want to say at the outset how privileged I am to be the first speaker from my party on this bill at third reading.

As a member of Parliament from an island province I can say in all modesty that those of us who come from islands have a greater understanding of some of the major issues involved in this outstanding project. Given that we have a better understanding of them we could be involved in the decision-making process and are able to understand the very difficult judgment factors involved in this historic project, as I believe it is safe to call it.

• (1045)

Second, I want to thank the hon. Minister of Public Works for his presentation. In his brief report to the House on third reading he addressed the issues involved without any frills and without any wool. I think the House should take note of his final comment which referred to the premier of Prince Edward Island. With her government representing all but one of the seats she certainly understands the way Prince Edward Islanders feel on this subject. That in itself would give an indication of how the litmus test should be applied to this project.

Third, I have discussed this project at length with my three hon. colleagues from Prince Edward Island, the members for Egmont, Hillsborough and Cardigan. They have demonstrated the amount of homework and difficult decisions they have had in the final analysis in essentially doing what they believe was best for their constituents. I know they have had some difficult conversations in their studies of the projects to look at the pros and cons.

They did not ask me to speak for them this morning but my assessment is that in their considerable and very sensitive deliberations they support what they objectively believe in the totality of all the considerations is right for all their constituents. Regrettably in this case decisions had to be made on a project that goes back more than 100 years and probably goes back to even when Prince Edward Island first became a colony in the 1700s. It is a very controversial and contentious issue.

I have admiration for the way they have tackled the issue, for their judgment and for the way they have shown consideration for all aspects of this important project, which regrettably has to be discussed in the dying days of Parliament and has to be subjected again to the infamous jackboot time allocation motion the government has put on the deliberations.

Those are my three introductory remarks. Now I want to give an outline of what I hope to do here today. I will be a little longer than normal because I believe, as the main speaker on the third reading representing the Liberal Party of Canada, the members of Parliament from Prince Edward Island and the premier of Prince Edward Island that it is very important to set the record straight and to cut through some of the confusing and somewhat negative comments that most of the members from the NDP spewed forth yesterday. I expect we will hear them today.

I am not saying that I am the harbinger of bad news or the bearer of tidings of good news. I do want to say as objectively as possible and as someone who is not a Prince Edward Islander that I would like to give some objective background to the project. Once the background is finished I would like to look at the bill and then provide some commentary, which I will provide as objectively as possible. With my concluding remarks I look forward to the rest of the debate in the House on this subject today.

Bill C-110, the act respecting the Northumberland Strait Crossing or the fixed link as it is now being called, was introduced by the Minister of Public Works and received first reading in December last year. The act essentially authorized the minister to enter into agreements with the public sector builder and the operator respecting that Prince Edward Island bridge crossing, including provisions for the annual subsidy and a mechanism for establishing tolls for the first 35 years, as well as authorizing the regulation of toll charges after onus for the bridge reverted to the Crown.

With that introduction the first thing that jumps to mind is that this is not the normal way of doing business. One of the difficulties with this project is that it has not been a standard government contract. It has not been a standard piece of legislation because private industry is

involved and there is ministerial authority in a different manner.

• (1050)

There are other aspects that impinge on the passage of the bill which make it somewhat different from the normal process. My experience when any project, particularly a project as sensitive and as complex as this one, deviates from the normal way of doing business is that it adds complexity and confuses the main issue. I am hoping we will be able to cut through that this morning.

As far as the background is concerned, it is well known but I just want to cover the highlights. Prince Edward Island became a colony in 1769. I doubt if people had an idea of a bridge in those days but certainly an island colony was established as far back as then. In 1832 the first link was established between Prince Edward Island and the mainland.

There were 30 milestones. I counted them in my research last night. I am not going to indulge the House with all those milestones. The next real milestone happened in 1885 when the very idea of a fixed link or something that was permanent between Prince Edward Island and the mainland came about. Senator George Oland was involved in it. It is safe to say that discussion of a fixed link started in 1885, which is more than 100 years ago.

The debate has been going on for 128 years, probably every day in one part or another of Prince Edward Island, as well as on the mainland and in federal, provincial, municipal and all other forms of government. Therefore this legislation is not about to pass in the House without some controversy and without some differing opinions. I believe people are allowed and should have different opinions. I hope to address some of them this morning.

When Prince Edward Island joined Confederation in 1873 the federal government undertook certain expenses. Pertinent to this discussion this morning, the first one was that it would protect the fisheries which were very important to Prince Edward Island. The second was to maintain an efficient steam service for the conveyance of mails and passengers to be established and maintained between the island and the mainland of the dominion in winter and summer, thus placing the island in continuous communications, and those are the key words, with the inter-colonial railway and the railway system of the dominion.

One of the difficulties in establishing this continuous communications with the mainland railway or the road system was caused by ice conditions that develop in the straits during the winter. Again, I am very familiar with the difficulty caused by ice in a channel or a strait connecting an island to the mainland.

I remember as a young midshipman in the navy in my training days having to wait in North Sydney. It was a great experience. It is a wonderful place with great hospitality. I had to wait three days in order to catch a ferry in the spring. I believe it was in May. For the first time the impact of the inconvenience caused by having to cross from the mainland to an island was brought home to me in a very personal and poignant way.

As early as the late 1880s, there is some question about the date, the Canadian Department of Public Works commissioned a British engineering firm to conduct a feasibility study on a tunnel. The development of efficient ice-breaking ferries supplanted the tunnel notion and in 1917-18, at the end of the Great War, the first year-round ferry service began with the advent of efficient and effective ice-breaking services.

I am going to skip all these 28 other milestones I reviewed with interest last night. While they are of interest I am sure those who are engaged in the debate would be cognizant of them. I leave the rest to review their history books if they are interested in it.

• (1055)

To jump very quickly to the debate on the present project, I suppose we could say it was most actively pursued in the mid-1980s when the federal cabinet authorized financial, socio-economic and environmental studies on the feasibility of a fixed crossing. To use vernacular terms we might say the system had decided to bite the bullet. A proposal call was issued in the spring of 1988, just before the last election was called. Three of the seven proposals were accepted.

In January 1988 the Government of Prince Edward Island held a plebiscite on the fixed crossing. Democracy went to work and a majority of islanders voted in favour of the concept. At that time there were both tunnel and bridge concepts. In the development of events, as I will point out, the tunnel project gave way to what we now have as a single option, a bridge. Part of the controversy

was whether the tunnel and the bridge would have been treated with equal measure, but I will not dwell on that.

In January 1989 the project was referred to a Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office panel. In August 1990 the panel reported that the risk of harmful effects had some difficulties under the existing terms of the project. I hasten to add that it did set an acceptable level of risk which would include an ice delay of no more than two days. I spoke earlier about the difficulties of ice. By that it meant the retention of ice in the Northumberland Strait for two days longer than normal in any 100-year period. That is considerable latitude. It certainly sounds reasonable to anybody who understands ice, sea and probability.

Essentially this meant that the project had to be designed so that it did not cause significant change in prevailing ice conditions, as well as being able to withstand the forces generated for constantly moving ice. The idea was that if the presence of the bridge structure were to cause increased ice accumulation in the strait by its being there, or result in a delay of ice-out as is the term used in the business, there might be a negative effect on the over-all marine environment in the area with possible implications on the existing strait fishery.

The Northumberland Strait fishery is of considerable value to the island economy and consists largely of lobster, scallop and herring. I have a great deal of consideration for the fishermen. I deal with them not just daily but almost every hour of every working day. Prince Edward Island is world famous for its lobster fishery and about 75 per cent of that takes place in the straits.

To the fishermen, depending on what sort of a season they have, it is worth anywhere from $45 million up to $60 million or more. When we look at unemployment and the state of the fishery today, that figure is a very serious one. It is one that has to be taken into consideration when we look at its over-all socio-economic effect. I am also familiar with the existence of scallop beds in the straits which is a consideration as well.

In January 1991 cabinet approved proceeding to select a developer to construct and operate the bridge. A committee of ice experts was formed. In April 1991 the ice committee reported that a bridge could be installed across the Northumberland Strait with no significant ice-out delay. Subsequently three developers made initial proposals. By January of last year, that is to say about 18 months ago, all three proposals were found to meet the environmental requirements.

In May 1992 when the three companies submitted their financial and security packages including the required level of federal subsidy, Public Works Canada declared that all three bids were non-compliant with the terms in the call for the project.

In July 1992 cabinet authorized discussions with a company called Strait Crossing Incorporated, SCI, for short. It was the lowest bidder. SCI was asked to determine whether its proposal could be modified to come within the parameters set out by the federal government.

• (1100)

In November cabinet authorized the negotiation of a contract with SCI. The Minister of Finance announced in his December 2 financial statement that advance engineering and environmental work would be undertaken to allow construction of the fixed link to begin in the spring of 1993.

As I said earlier, this fixed link project is unlike any other infrastructure project because it is financed, constructed, owned and operated by a private sector consortium which after 35 years of operation will transfer it back to the federal government. This approach, which I believe stems from the original 1985-86 proposals, essentially means that the project is being watched very closely to determine whether the funding mechanism is applicable to similar public infrastructure projects. If this works it will be a pilot project of some magnitude.

The bridge itself will derive revenues from two sources. One source will be the talked about $42 million a year subsidy from the federal government which will be payable for 35 years. This approximates the annual subsidy that would have been paid for a ferry operator and adjusted by approximately 50 per cent for various factors. The other source is a toll that will be levied on users as calculated on either 1990 tolls adjusted by the Consumer Price Index or on the tolls collected by the

ferry operators in the last year of service. Anyway it approximates $18 million to $20 million a year.

This brings us to the real crux of the debate today at third reading. Just before Christmas last year, on December 16, a tripartite agreement was reached among the Government of Canada, the province of Prince Edward Island and the province of Nova Scotia for a fixed link. It was based on 10 conditions set out by the premier of Prince Edward Island in a letter written in 1987 to the Minister of Public Works, which I read last night. It was a very clever idea to submit that letter. It addressed a lot of the proposals people had before 1987. While the proposals are well known to my hon. colleagues from Prince Edward Island and those involved in the discussion, I think for public debate it is worth while just to mention very briefly what these were.

Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick would both receive funds for upgrading their highway systems. It worked out to $20.4 million each. The ferry service between Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia would continue to operate. That was the Wood Island–Caribou ferry. Land to construct the approach roads would be assembled by the federal government and transferred to the provinces. Tolls would be fair and reasonable. That is very important to the economy of the island and to those people who would use the bridge.

The developer would offer new jobs to displaced ferry workers who were qualified on the fixed crossing. It would develop an appropriate assistance program for ferry workers not receiving new jobs on the fixed link.

I could not pass over that without highlighting the importance of looking after those people who through no fault of their own sacrifice their jobs for the betterment of their society and Prince Edward Island. I do not think there is any question the onus is on the system to ensure they are looked after. They should not be looked after in a perfunctory fashion or given a minimum package but looked after in a dignified, reasonable and respectable way, bearing in mind what their earning power and potential for finding other jobs would have been.

The two communities at either end of the ferry service, Borden and Tormentine, would receive up to $20 million of special development funds between them. The economic benefits to the Atlantic region would be maximized.

The developer must complete an environmental management plan acceptable to the federal government and the three maritime governments would also agree with it.

The next point is very important. Fishermen adversely affected by the construction of the bridge would be compensated by the developer.

• (1105)

I mentioned the importance of the lobster and herring fisheries, the existence of the scallop bed and the tremendous contribution fishermen make to the economy of Prince Edward Island. Finally the utility corridor would be incorporated into the design of the bridge.

Those 10 conditions certainly have indicated to me the concern the Government of Prince Edward Island has shown for the well-being of those people, communities and industries that would be and will be affected by the project.

Going back to the constitutional obligation of the federal government contained in the terms of union there is still a hangover from some interpretation there. In my mind that interpretation with respect to the agreement and the limitation of the constitutional obligations of the federal government contained in the terms of the agreement were covered by a recent presentation by the premier of Prince Edward Island. That was an important aspect of the whole project.

Time is rolling on and there are other aspects I would like to cover. I cannot leave this without saying I am cognizant of the socio-economic impact this has on the people of Prince Edward Island, mainly those who did not favour this link in the plebiscite.

It is my opinion that while in a democracy the majority does speak we cannot ignore the concerns of those people who for their own reasons, beliefs and judgments do believe that given the choice they would rather not participate in this project. They argue the government has not complied with the environmental assessment review process guidelines. In addition they claim Canada's agreement with Prince Edward Island and the company SCI would contravene the terms of union both

by allowing the cessation of continuous communications and by failing to protect the fisheries.

I believe these are legitimate concerns but I also believe some if not all of them have been addressed. The failure to protect the fisheries has been considered by Premier Ghiz in the 10 points in his letter to the Government of Canada. The efficient service has been addressed in kind. I will speak to the terms of union before I conclude.

To summarize, the main issues surrounding the fixed link appear to be the costs, the unique means of financing, the environmental impacts, particularly the possible effect of ice build-up on the bridge and consequently the Northumberland Strait fisheries, and finally the impact of a fixed link on the traditional island way of life. I have sensitivity for the last one as I mentioned earlier.

In any impact analysis that is done on the likely consequences of something this major there are a number of ways to approach it. I do not want to and I cannot because I was not involved in the process, but I am convinced it was done objectively.

No matter how the sums are awarded and no matter how objective or subjective we are, essentially we are dealing with three things when looking at an impact analysis.

We look at the magnitude of the predicted effect. We are dealing with uncertainty. We have to take best case and worst case and do what is called a sensitivity analysis. I am very familiar with those tools. The magnitude of the predicted effect is looked at first of all. The importance of that effect to the quality of life whether it is social, environmental or economic is looked at. The third thing to look at is the likelihood or probability of its occurrence. There are three things: how important it is, how strong it is, and the likelihood of it happening.

There are various combinations. There may be a change in one factor which would be relatively unimportant. However, it could have the same significance as a small change that would be very important to the quality of life. What I am saying is that when these three factors are taken and the sums awarded on the ice impact, the impact of winds and tides and the impact of terrestrial concerns, we are left with a number of judgmental factors. We are dealing with judgmental factors here. This is why anything that is not judgmental or can be done quantitatively is very seldom open for criticism based on subjectivity.

• (1110)

The number of studies done on this matter in recent times has been phenomenal. There have been 91 studies of one kind or another on this subject: 24 different environmental assessments, 17 different studies with regard to ice, 4 comprehensive studies with respect to wind and tide, 9 different studies with respect to socio-economic benefits of the particular project, 23 different studies done by organizations of great renown such as the Atlantic Provinces Economic Council and various businesses, 10 terrestrial studies, and 4 reports on the list of strait crossings and other related reports. There have been 91 studies identified.

If we look at some of the peripheral studies like the Library of Parliament research and individual studies I am aware of but have not seen, I would say there have been well over 100 studies done on this project.

I am dealing with uncertainty. It is very dangerous when one is standing in the House of Commons to make any predictions, but I would predict that if we allowed this to go on for another hundred years there would be another hundred studies. If not a year, we would study this for an indefinite period and we would still not be able to address the subjective judgment of those who are not in favour of the project.

I respect that. I understand that. I have a feeling for it and I am sensitive to it. I have been involved in many projects where the line was not clear and it was not 100 per cent agreed upon. There were a lot of judgmental factors. That is why we have governments. It is to make judgments. When one is in a position to make judgments one makes them and goes with the effects. When one makes those judgments one should wake up in the morning and say: "I made that judgment as objectively as possible with no consideration for myself, self-gain or self-aggrandizement. I made that judgment for the good of why I had to make the judgment".

If one is here as a politician and has to make a judgment on something that important, one studies all the factors and knows all the concerns to go forward with the best information for the judgment. This is part of one's chemistry, constituency, understanding, upbringing

and education: the input factors, the whole works. Then one goes for a decision. This is what has happened here.

I am not going to spend much time on the bill. It is surprisingly a very small bill. There are very few things in the bill. The first few portions refer to definitions as any legislative bill does. There was considerable discussion on the Consumer Price Index. That is an important aspect because depending on what base one takes one could be affected downstream.

Clauses 4 and 5 really give authority for the minister to enter into and carry out the agreements relating to the fixed link. Clause 6 authorizes the minister to lease any Crown property necessary for the construction and operation of the bridge. Clause 7 provides for an annual subsidy of $42 million for 35 years adjusted in accordance with the Consumer Price Index. Clause 8 states the subsidy could not be retained as a set-off against or deduction from any sum owed to the Crown.

In order to give the potential investors the same level of assurance as with a direct government guaranteed loan, the government would forgo the possibility of withholding the subsidy in order to make good debts owed by the developers, for example in default of income tax payment. Clause 8 essentially would affect the Financial Administration Act and the right to offset for taxes owed.

Finally clause 9 allows the Minister of Transport to set tolls by regulation when the agreement with the developer has expired or is otherwise terminated.

The next thing I want to deal with is a recent occurrence in the Legislative Assembly of Prince Edward Island.

• (1115)

Premier Callbeck, a colleague of ours who represented her constituency of Malpeque in an outstanding manner like her other three colleagues from Prince Edward Island, did something very important in the Prince Edward Island legislative assembly shortly after it opened. She made a speech on this subject. It was very brave for her to take this matter on in the early mandate of what she had to do. She reminded her province and the Government of Canada that a clear majority of islanders supported the project, the federal government supported the project and her government supported the project.

She also pointed out, as did the hon. Minister of Public Works, there had been extensive debate and 100 studies and consultations showing that islanders wanted this project to proceed. She made reference to the recent court action taken and the subsequent decision handed down. She made reference to the fact that the action was used to better the project. She made reference to the companion agreement that amended or amplified the December 1992 tripartite agreement with Canada, Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia. She had negotiated it and announced what it reflected.

I talked about the terms of union. The first and perhaps most important aspect was that Canada's constitutional obligation to provide continuous communication had been preserved. That was a very important aspect. Hopefully it will allay the fears of some people who have been sceptical about the project. The resolution and the amending agreement did not alter the obligation of the federal government. The obligation that went back to the terms of union, as I stated at the outset of this presentation, still pertain. Therefore there is no need for interpretation or scepticism. It is there. It has been negotiated. It has been announced by the premier of Prince Edward Island.

For the base year of operation the toll would be determined using 1992 Marine Atlantic rates plus an adjustment for the Consumer Price Index rather than 1996 rates as had been previously negotiated or realized. I was going to say it was forced upon the Prince Edward Island government, but it is too smart for that and would not accept it.

Essentially, without going into details, this clever bit of negotiation by Premier Callbeck and her colleagues means there will be a savings of about $250 million in the life of the project. There were some other aspects but those were the most important in my mind.

I have done pretty well what I said I was going to do. I just want to add some concluding remarks. The study of this project was not only interesting. It showed the passion that has gone into this project and the number of people who have been involved. Often we speak on bills in the House affecting various interest groups, certain industries, certain provinces and certain regions of Canada. It has been seldom that I have had the opportunity to speak on a bill that has been so universally of interest to all people involved. It is going to affect the way of life of

every person who lives now, has lived in the past and will live in the future of this great province.

There are some benefits other than the over-all benefits. I am now talking about the job creation that is going to be involved. The subsidy will be guaranteed. However from my perspective Bill C-110 is not only crucial to the fixed link financing process. I believe the fixed link will be of great benefit to Prince Edward Island.

The construction of the bridge will provide approximately 1,000 direct jobs for nine months over the next five years. It is going to be great for five years. The proportion of labour to come from within the region is 90 per cent. In addition Public Works Canada estimates that 50 per cent to 60 per cent of materials and equipment will be purchased in the region. Transportation and tourist industries also expect to see significant economic benefits as the fixed link makes travel through Prince Edward Island quicker and more reliable.

• (1120)

As for the environmental impacts I am not going to repeat what I said. However when we have studied something as long, as strenuously and as objectively, with 100 studies in four or five different crucial fields, we can assure ourselves as we vote in favour of the bill that life is not perfect but this is about as close to perfection as we are going to get.

In conclusion essentially the transportation aspect or the convenience of the link is after all the most important aspect. Prince Edward Island will no longer be subjected to an intermittent transportation service. If one wants to get there one will be able to get there. It will no longer be subjected to transportation uncertainties. How often have I heard people say they wished to go to the island but they were not sure when they would get there. No longer will Prince Edward Island be subjected to diverse and protracted debate. It will no longer be subjected to unfettered toll increases.

I consider it a privilege to have been given the opportunity to speak on behalf of the Liberal Party on the project. I am cognizant of the difficulties associated with the 100-year history and the totality of the project, certainly in the last five years. I commend my colleagues from Prince Edward Island who have devoted their efforts to understanding every aspect of the issue. I commend them on their objectivity.

I ask the House to consider these points when the bill comes up for vote in the near future. We should consider that the passage of the bill is for the good of Prince Edward Island and of all Canada.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. O'Kurley): The next speakers will have 20 minutes, followed by a period of 10 minutes of questions and comments.

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, the debate on Bill C-110, as Canadians particularly from Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick interested in the project know, has been very much like Alice in Wonderland. We heard this morning from the Minister of Public Works. We have heard now from the official spokesperson for the Liberal Party. Both those parties paint this bridge as having no environmental impact worthy of consideration and that the only positive benefits will be for Islanders and for the maritime economy.

I listened with care to both previous speakers. Both of them touched briefly on the concerns of what may be the majority of islanders and a substantial number of the hundreds of thousands of maritime Canadians. In both cases they quickly swept the concerns of those Canadians under the rug. In particular there are the fishers of the Northumberland Strait and the islanders who love their way of life and are quite satisfied with the ferry service. Canadians should be aware that all this talk about enormous delays and inadequacies of the ferry service is not borne out by reality. During 1992 of the more than 1,300 sailings only five were even delayed.

Where I come from on the north coast of British Columbia we are thankful if our ferry even sails once a week. In Hecate Strait we face 100-mile an hour winds. This last winter an 84-foot wave was recorded coming in through Dixon Entrance. We face just as ferocious and just as wild a marine environment as does anyone on the Northumberland Strait. The argument that a short delay or a bit of icing up is sufficient to take the kinds of risks contained in this bridge proposal is a foolhardy and dangerous approach to any kind of a major development.

The Liberals and Conservatives have gone further on the bill. I know many who watched the debate phoned and faxed me yesterday because they wondered what was going on in the Chamber. The Liberals and Conserva-

tives consistently used tag-team tactics to suggest the entire process had been proper, legal and constitutional, which it was not. They both go further to attack the NDP every time they have an opportunity for pointing out that the process to date was riddled with corruption and false arguments.

Certainly the lobbyists for SCI across the street must be happy knowing that they have found such fertile ground to till with the Velcro lips of both the Conservatives and Liberals about the real issues involved in Bill C-110 and the development of the project.

• (1125)

This bridge has not been assessed by a public panel. We have Liberal after Conservative after Liberal waving sheaves of paper around saying there have been 92 studies, or the Liberals now saying there have been 91 studies at a cost of $20 million over many years. There have been studies. A generic bridge concept was taken before a public environmental assessment panel. It was reviewed and it was turned down. It was rejected.

SCI has come forward with a specific bridge design on which Bill C-13, the new Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, can be reflected long and hard. Once we have a specific proposal then we have a public environmental assessment and review of it. If a generic public review of a particular kind of heart surgery was turned down and the same doctors came up with a similar proposal for a specific form of heart surgery, would we not want it reviewed and assessed before it was used?

The arguments used in the Chamber by the Liberals and Conservatives make me extremely ill as a parliamentarian. It is with great sadness I have watched these two parties argue falsely and I believe corruptly and contemptuously an existing court order by Madam Justice Barbara Reed. The constitutional question has neither been addressed nor passed by Prince Edward Island or by this Parliament.

Mr. MacDonald (Dartmouth): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There are rules of procedure and some words are not used by hon. members in referring to other members in the Chamber. The member knows that. He has just accused members of the government and the opposition of being corrupt. If he has allegations of corruption he should put them instead of using his time to make unparliamentary comments.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I will review the "blues" and get back to the hon. member. The hon. member is a senior member in the Chamber and should know better. If he is stepping beyond the boundary of the rules of the House, I wish he would apologize and stick to the rules.

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Speaker, nothing I have said, and you will find that when you check the "blues", was unparliamentary. It is typical of the Liberals to want to butt into my time. What I have said in this Chamber I will say outside the Chamber in front of the cameras at any time.

Let me read from the ruling of Madam Justice Barbara Reed earlier this year. It is extremely germane for Canadians, particularly residents of Prince Edward Island, to know just how poorly they have been represented by their MPs from Prince Edward Island and by the government on this issue.

Let me quote from what Madam Justice Reed had to say:

> Public hearings on a generic proposal are not a substitute for a specific evaluation of the actual project which it is planned to construct. If specific design proposals had been referred to the panel this might be different. It is particularly disturbing, in this case, to find that a generic design was referred to a panel when the government had access to more detailed information, respecting the three concept proposals being considered, which was not referred—

> The argument that continual section 12 assessments would be required at every stage of the process is not convincing. It may very well be that continual assessment and reassessment is a convenient way of proceeding but that does not answer the fact that section 12 requires the assessment of a proposal when it is available in a form in which the environmental considerations can be fully considered.

The Federal Court of Canada then ruled that the Minister of Public Works has failed to comply with the requirements of section 12 of the environmental assessment review process guidelines order and that "a discontinuance of the ferry service which presently operates between Cape Tormentine, New Brunswick, and Borden, Prince Edward Island, without being sanc-

tioned by an amendment pursuant to section 43 of the Constitution Act, 1982, would be unconstitutional".

The Federal Court then ordered: "The Minister of Public Works, the Minister of Transport and other representatives of the Government of Canada shall not make any irrevocable decision relating to the specific SCI proposal until after a section 12 decision is made and the documentation relating thereto is released to the public pursuant to section 15 of the environmental assessment review process guidelines".

This matter has been to the courts. This is what the Federal Court of Canada has said. It is a shall clause; it is not may. The court said: "Shall not make any irrevocable decision until section 12 is complied with".

• (1130)

The Minister of Public Works this morning rose in his place and said that once Bill C-110 had made its way through Parliament he would consider section 12. That is a contempt of court.

I have spoken to Mr. Marleau, Clerk of the House. I recognize as you do, Mr. Speaker—and I have been here going on 15 years—that this is the highest court in the land. We make the laws. We interpret in many cases what the Constitution means and where the country should go.

We have had a specific court case on the 1984 cabinet guidelines order. A finding has been made that this trickle theory of continually doing section 12 assessments but never taking the specific proposal back to an environmental assessment and review the public of Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick can participate in is not on. It is just not on.

We have seen this kind of false argument—

Mr. MacKay: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have been enjoying my colleague's speech in the lobby. I wanted to come in and tell him it is obvious he cannot count. He is confusing section 12 with section 13.

I rose in my place and told him that in compliance with Madam Justice Reed's decision I had exercised, as *Hansard* will show, section 12. Members heard this. I just want to point out to my friend that there is a difference between section 12 and section 13 of the environmental regulations.

Mr. Fulton: I certainly appreciate that, Mr. Speaker, but it does not deal with either part of the order made by Madam Justice Reed in terms of irrevocable decision. The hope by the Minister of Public Works, the government benches and the Liberal benches is all the same. The Liberals should be sitting on the Tory side of the House today because there does not seem to be any serious consideration of what is required. The generic bridge proposal was turned down by an environmental assessment and specific studies were given to the panel.

We all know why SCI and the government are hiding away from a public environmental assessment. It is because of the placement of the piers. The whole question of ice-out will once again reappear. The Minister of Public Works knows why the four so-called ice experts never published their findings and never placed their findings out for peer review as is required ordinarily in these kinds of engineering and scientific matters. Hundreds of millions of dollars in lobster, scallop and groundfish are at risk. Ordinarily one would find that but not in this case; there has been no EARP of the specific SCI bridge.

The generic bridge was turned down. The Federal Court ordered that there be no irrevocable decisions by the government until the provisions of EARP had been met. EARP has been avoided continuously by this government. On Kemano II it was found that the government acted both illegally and unconstitutionally in exempting Alcan's project. Alcan led the fight for the government in the last federal election on free trade. Alcan was right there at the front. Here is its pay-back.

This House itself has agreed unanimously with the report from the standing committee on regulations that was illegal and unconstitutional, but the ministers responsible have done nothing to remedy it.

We move over to Alberta and the Oldman River dam. Who do we find there? SCI, the same corporation that is involved in the fixed link. When it came to the damming of the Oldman, SCI joined with the Government of Alberta and the federal Conservative Party in fighting against the public every step of the way until the highest court in Canada ruled there had to be an environmental assessment. When the assessment took place it ordered that the dam be taken down, that it was neither economically nor environmentally sound.

If the specific SCI bridge proposal were ever to be put before a proper environmental assessment and review I predict it would meet the same fate as the Oldman River dam. It would be turned down. This is a megaproject scam by the same corporation, with the same beneficia-

ries. It is a foreign corporation, 70 per cent foreign owned.

What of the other 23 recommendations? There were 24 recommendations on the Oldman River dam. The government has never lived up to a single one. The first one was to tear it down after it was built.

• (1135)

At least now we have the opportunity to sensibly, sanely, legally and constitutionally review the fixed link. No say the Liberals, no say the Conservatives, let us not have a public environmental assessment and review of the specific bridge because we would find out what was wrong with it. We want a quick fix. We want an injection of a few hundred million dollars into our constituencies. That is what this is all about. That is all it is.

For the Minister of Public Works to continually rise and say this is a private sector project, gag me with a spoon. Give us a break. This is the biggest trough, sell-off, giveaway, kick-back I have seen in years in this place, $1.47 billion. We the taxpayers pay for a bridge the Minister of Public Works says is going to cost $800 million to build, plus SCI gets to collect tolls for 35 years.

None of the Liberals and none of the Conservatives want to rise and say to the average family of four, with a car, on the day of opening of the bridge what the tolls are going to be. Should not the people in P.E.I. and New Brunswick at least be told in advance what the tolls are going to be? Another secret, another special deal.

The recent process undertaken by SCI and public works is not EARP. Nothing in the material produced by public works is of a nature to suggest the major bridge impacts are either known or mitigable. In yesterday's *Financial Post* we found an article headlined "P.E.I.'s fixed link going to court again". I quote:

> The review was completed and released in mid-May by Public Works Minister Elmer MacKay but Mark Freiman, counsel for Friends of the Island said it made no attempt to meet the requirements of the court order or the standards set in the government's own assessment guidelines. The study included no basis for its conclusion that the bridge's environmental impact would be insignificant, Freiman said.

The Minister of Public Works interrupted my speech to say study section 13 of EARP. I am abundantly aware of what section 13 says, but this private little study cooked up by SCI and public works is irrelevant because it is a vacuum. The information required is not contained there to come to the conclusions it claims to reach, that there will be no major damage and that anything that could occur is mitigable. It is a false argument. It is a contempt of the intelligence of the average Canadian voter. I find it particularly awkward to continue to hear it from the Minister of Public Works whom I consider to be a good friend and a good parliamentarian.

As I have said a number of times, the Federal Court order of Madam Justice Barbara Reed has not been met and no attempt has been made to meet it. Only later today will the amendment proposed in the legislature of Prince Edward Island even come up to begin debate. There is nothing before the House and there is nothing in the foreseeable future to suggest that a constitutional amendment would just drift in here on a Friday afternoon and drift on back out again. I find that somewhat idle thinking. I do not think any court in the country that followed the Charlottetown process would think the amendments were suddenly going to start floating through this place on Friday afternoons.

The passage of Bill C-110 is part of an irrevocable decision. There is a seamless web in terms of the movement of decisions. The government is well aware of that. It will put into play a series of other actions, not the least of which will be the quick movement of SCI to get some signed contracts, making it impossible for a government that maintains the public interest first rather than the corporate interest first to review and put this back into the proper perspective it deserves, which at the very least is a proper public environmental assessment and review.

The abuse of process deserves some moments in the House because the EARP panel said no on many grounds, not just on ice. Even this so-called, cooked up ice expert panel only dealt with a very small part of the major concerns brought forward by experts who reviewed the generic bridge proposal.

The government chose to smoke-screen on the ice issue. Let us take a look at what Mr. Weale had to say when he appeared before the legislative committee dealing with Bill C-110 on March 11 of this year. He

teaches at the University of Prince Edward Island. I know that many Liberals and Conservatives get the chilly-willys whenever his name is quoted because he is one of those who has actually driven to the bottom of this file and learned just how false the arguments are which are used by the Liberals and Conservatives.

• (1140)

Let me quote first from page 218:

> The first is the constitutional aspect of this debate. There was a clearly stated agreement between Prince Edward Island and the federal government, or the Dominion Government at the time of the province's entry into Confederation in 1873, that the federal government would agree to defray all costs associated with the operation of the province's link with the mainland. It is our contention that the handing over of the ownership and operation of this link to a private corporation and a subsequent paying of tolls by Islanders to that corporation is an abrogation of the terms of P.E.I.'s entry into Confederation. The terms of agreement are quite specific.

This is important for the record because both the Liberals and the Conservatives have misstated, and I believe intentionally, what is really said in the terms of union because here is what it says:

> The dominion government shall assume and defray all charges for the following services: vis. efficient steam service for the conveyance of mails and passengers, to be established and maintained between the island and the mainland of the dominion winter and summer thus placing the Island in continuous communication with the inter-colonial railway and the railway systems of the dominion.

I go down further and I read again. The Minister of Public Works recently stated in the House of Commons:

> The underlying principle is that the cost to the Canadian taxpayers for the construction and operation of a bridge should not exceed the operating and capital costs of the Borden and Cape Tormentine ferry service over the next 35 years. The subsidy would be approximately $42 million annually based on 1992 constant dollars.

The minister continues to insist that the bridge will not entail additional cost to the Canadian taxpayer. Here is where the big question comes in. Marine Atlantic which actually operates the service has claimed that it could operate the ferry service over the next 35 years for much less than the $42 million annual subsidy being offered to the bridge builder.

In its brief to the environmental panel, Marine Atlantic stated:

> Our plans and projections show quite clearly that government subsidies will be in the range of $25.2 million to $28.1 million per year maximum over the next 35-year period depending on whether new vessels are built in Canada or offshore. Those figures include not only the operating subsidy but also the level of support Ottawa would give us for capital projects such as new ships.

That sort of trashes the arguments that we have heard from the minister, from his parliamentary secretary and from the Liberals that this is some kind of a cost saving device. As I said, this is a gigantic giveaway to a foreign owned private corporation. It gets $1.47 billion in fixed 1992 dollars. It could in fact be far higher if there is any inflation between now and 35 years from now. It gets all the tolls plus 75 per cent if the Consumer Price Index rises in each given year. That is just another little add-on profit.

The Gordon Capital financial analysis, which no one on the government side and none of the Liberals has gone after as being false in any way, has pointed out that the reason the $42 million was chosen was to give more cash up front to its friends who live in Houston and London. That is what the government is doing.

Let us take a look at what kind of an analysis one of the other corporations which analysed the ice question had to say. Should this pass, should this carry on in contempt of Parliament without a constitutional amendment, carry on in contempt of court without an environmental assessment having been properly carried through, here is what we should be concerned about. Let me just close with a very brief quote from Bechtel Canada Incorporated with regard to the Northumberland Strait crossing project. It says:

> Our data described in the attached brief which we incorporated in our bridge design is at considerable variance with that of Public Works Canada.

The last sentence is worthy of being on the record:

> The results of the studies were also at variance with other design parameters set by Public Works Canada relating to service, reliability and life of the structure. However the question of ice loading is fundamental to the integrity of the project and failure to adequately recognize this parameter could be catastrophic.

• (1145)

The people of Canada are being asked to buy a pig in a poke. That ferry service would maintain more jobs over the long term, vessel construction in Canada creating jobs, a more permanent protection for the environment in the Northumberland Strait for lobster, scallop, groundfish and the marine environment. It would allow us to put to sleep all the problems I have addressed here on other occasions.

I, unlike the government and the Liberals, welcome questions on this matter and my knowledge of it.

Hon. Elmer M. MacKay (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I want to straighten out a couple of bits of misinformation in a good natured way.

The ice experts reports that my friend in his very bombastic way referred to as not being published were published. The initial one was published and the final one was published. These ice experts, world famous people, attended all the public meetings so that was not correct.

It is also worth noting that Madame Justice Reed in her decision said: "The constitutional amendment is not required until a ferry service is replaced which is several years".

To paraphrase Ogden Nash he once said that maybe the one thing for which Canadian politics would be very much the better would be a more restricted use of simile and metaphor. Let us keep this thing factual if nothing else.

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Speaker, let me deal first with what the minister had to say about the ice experts and that their reports were published.

The minister may be trying to indicate it was typed out on paper and was made available to the public. This finding that they made to my knowledge—I stand to be corrected by the minister—was never published in a scientific journal for peer review. If it was I think the minister should rise and give us the date and the name of the publication in which that occurred.

On the second matter the minister suggests in terms of what Madam Justice Barbara Reed said: "A discontinuance of the ferry service which presently operates between Cape Tormentine, New Brunswick, and Borden, P.E.I., without being sanctioned by amendment pursuant to section 43 of the Constitution Act, 1982, would be unconstitutional". I think that speaks for itself.

What the minister then fails to pay direct attention to is what the court then ordered. The court ordered that the Government of Canada "shall not make any irrevocable decision relating to the specific SCI proposal". The minister suggests that there has not been an irrevocable decision made.

It seems to me that one of the things the courts has to take into account is that at some point an irrevocable decision has been made. Completing the passage of a bill that provides for the withdrawal of $1.47 billion from Canada's Treasury is surely an irrevocable decision.

If the government really wanted to play on a level playing-field on this, on a whole variety of levels, environmental, legal, constitutional and public concern, surely at the front of the train would be a public environmental assessment and review of the specific bridge proposal.

I would be the first to congratulate the minister for saying finally we are starting to get the engine on the front of the train instead of at the back of the train. Let us review the specific proposal and then let us deal with the constitutional amendment. Until Canadians are assured of what are the impacts of the bridge, if those impacts can be mitigated and if they can be mitigated what the costs are, we cannot start seriously and intelligently addressing it. Instead what we are seeing is the government shoving it through this House, the P.E.I. legislature trying to squeeze a constitutional amendment through and SCI out there with its hand out asking for the $1.47 billion cheque.

What are the courts to do in this case? The Friends of Prince Edward Island have applied for injunction. At what point are the courts to say an irrevocable decision has been made? Once the bridge has been completed? No. Once the bridge begins? No. Once the decision is finally completed by Parliament? Somewhere in this very part of the debate we are talking about an irrevocable decision is about to be made in contempt of what the Federal Court has already found.

Mr. Al Johnson (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a brief comment and perhaps ask a question.

Hon. members may not be aware but this may be the last major speech the hon. member for Skeena is making in the House, if we do not do too much work between now and the next election.

I did not want the opportunity to go by without making a comment about a young man I knew 22 years ago who worked for me on a project in Yukon at Yukon Revenue. He showed at that time the same type of energy, enthusiasm and I might say wild disregard for the

environment the hon. member now shows for truth and accuracy when he speaks to us in such a bombastic way.

I wonder if the member would mind relating to us how that young man traversed the course I believe he has from one who had I thought a total disregard for the environment to one who now is respected quite widely regarding the concern he has for the environment, despite perhaps the exaggeration which he brings to the role as critic.

• (1150)

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Speaker, I suppose the difference between me and some members of the House is that I have the capacity to learn. Back in the days when I worked with my pal from Alberta outside Carmacks on a large gold property—I hope we do not affect the shares by talking about it in here today—one of the things he did as the boss, if we can believe it, was to get me to follow along behind a D-8 Cat. The Cat would drop its blade and a take a great gouge out of the environment. I would have a little teaspoon and I would take a scoop of dirt to put in a little paper envelope that I would give to him. Then he would sit in his trailer. Of course we were living in tents and he had a trailer. He would sit in there with his little spy glasses and other glasses that we could hear tinkling as he was working away and he would analyse it to determine whether that was a good location for us to drill.

I also worked on the drill platform at that time. We were doing percussion drilling on an old glacial alluvial plain as he is wont to say, great gold-bearing property that one day will come into fruition when we have a giant mole machine that can get the gold from underground without having to remove 300 or 400 feet of overburden. I suppose he is referring to those kinds of jobs he used to send me out on that were environmentally unfriendly.

In the good spirit of this place I must say over all he was actually a very charming and likeable fellow to work with. I wish him well in his career in this place.

In ending my speech I must say in the face of the overwhelming tidal wave of whitewash from the government side and from the Liberals on this project that I think the future will prove me right. This project should be subjected to a full environmental assessment and review. If it is I predict that major faults in the design will be found in terms of particularly the movement of ice and the impact on the marine environment.

As to the issues of concern of those who live in Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick about the effect on their way of life, regrettably they have had no one from that area who has risen to extol the concerns they have, whether about increased tourism or reduced jobs in terms of the ferries or all the other myriad kinds of impacts there would be, not the least of which was presented by one of the witnesses who appeared before the legislative committee, and I quote:

> There will be people here representing the ferry workers, but I think it is significant to recognize that the loss of approximately 600 jobs on Prince Edward Island in one fell swoop represents a loss the equivalent of which would be the loss of 60,000 to 70,000 jobs in one fell swoop in the province of Ontario. That is the kind of initial cost that we will be paying for building this fixed link.

I end this speech—it may be my last; it may not—with good wishes to you, Mr. Speaker, a great Albertan, a great Speaker; to our missing Speaker from Vancouver South; to all those on the government benches; to all the Liberals; to all my colleagues in the New Democratic Party; and to my colleague from Annapolis Valley—Hants. I have enjoyed working here the last 14 or so years. I wish you all well and I wish this institution good luck in the future.

• (1155)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I know the House will wish you well also.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, as the member for Madawaska—Victoria in the province of New Brunswick, I welcome this opportunity to support the bill before us today which sets out to accomplish a number of things in the maritimes, and especially in Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick.

Mr. Speaker, as we listen to the speeches in this House, and especially in this debate on a bill that concerns the region where I come from, it is somewhat disappointing when we hear some of the arguments being advanced to try and persuade members to vote against a bill that will give the Minister of Public Works, my colleague and good friend, the hon. member for Central Nova in Nova Scotia, the authority to proceed with this project for the benefit of the country.

I find this odd, as we come out of a recession, at a time when many Canadians across this country have been severely affected, not just by the recession but by the winds of change sweeping across our economy, and not only our economy but the global economy. Since 1984, during its past two terms, this government has tried to fully restructure certain aspects of our economy. In fact, we have come out of this last recession in far better shape than we were in 1982.

As we come out of this recession, with a slow but steady recovery in the manufacturing sector, it is often said that the fundamentals of our economy must be in place, and they are. Interest rates are low, inflation has been brought down to minimal levels and, as a result, we have an economic climate that is conducive to investment.

Nevertheless, every single day in this House, I see members of the New Democratic Party rise and ask the government what it intends to do. At least the Liberals are consistent, because for years they have argued in favour of major investments in infrastructure projects, to create jobs and also to create new wealth. At a time when Atlantic Canada is about to obtain the tools to improve its position as a producer and as a participant in Canada's economy, there are people who object to this, for their own particular reasons. Whether they are talking about the environment or the number of jobs provided on the ferries, the implication is that the government should look only to the past and reject proposals that would help our country and our provinces and regions improve the economic circumstances of all Canadians.

There is no one on the Liberal or the government side who would argue that this project is being supported for the purpose of destroying the environment or the way of life of our fishermen.

• (1200)

I was once Minister of Fisheries and Oceans myself, and I know the fishermen in this particular part of the maritimes. Far be it from us to try to impose anything or do anything that might destroy that environment.

Members opposite who object to this bill are always eager to get up there and shout that they are in favour of sustainable development. However, sustainable development does not mean stopping investment and infrastructure development that might have an impact on the environment. The important thing is to control this impact in order to protect the quality of life of our fellow citizens and to encourage economic development as well. In this particular case, it is predicted that building a bridge between Prince Edward Island and the rest of the country will definitely stimulate the economy, not only in New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and the maritimes in general but in the whole Atlantic region, and this was in fact confirmed by witnesses appearing before the legislative committee.

Of course, there are people who prefer to remember what was said by those who were against the project, but someone as distinguished as Vice-President Colin Dodds of St. Mary's University said in his testimony before the committee, confirming what many economists had concluded: "There can be a cascade of benefits—this fixed link could result in a significant restructuring of the economy and a significant restructuring of investment. So not only do we get this primary investment, we get a series of induced investments."

This project is the ideal solution and would act as a catalyst for economic renewal in the Atlantic provinces. We all say people must regain confidence in the economy. All the fundamentals are in place.

They tell me the economy must recover. What else would motivate the private sector to enter into a partnership with both levels of government to carry out this project, if not the prevailing economic climate? Investors who support the private sector project will be able to do so because of affordable interest rates and reasonable levels of inflation. People should realize that investments are being made that will create jobs.

We all know, as I said earlier, that this project is the ideal solution and will act as a catalyst for economic renewal in the Atlantic provinces.

Several witnesses appeared before the committee. According to our NDP friends, Joe Ghiz, Ms. Callbeck, the new premier of Prince Edward Island, Frank McKenna and all the other people who support this project are wrong. According to our socialist friends, all these people are working against the interests of Canada, Prince Edward Island and the maritimes.

I do not think Canadians would agree with this assumption, because this country and what it produces is far greater that the sum of its parts. Canada's synergy is created by its regions, which together try to give Canadians a decent standard of living and, above all, opportunity. When I say opportunity, as someone from New Brunswick, I see benefits, and not only economic ones, to the quality of life of our business community. The economy as such is not the objective. The objective is to give our people a decent standard of living, to give them jobs so they can—

An hon. member: So they can live at home with their families.

Mr. Valcourt: Yes, so they can live with their families and watch their children grow up with dignity.

• (1205)

That is exactly what this will help do for the economic problems we have in the Atlantic region. The other day, they were the first to be offended and make a big scene when a government member said that there was terrible poverty in the Atlantic region. I think that poverty is no worse there than in many other regions of the country, although we do have problems.

When we want to stimulate economic growth for the social benefits it provides, those people are opposed for what I would call partisan motives. We must not hide it, everyone knows that that party sees what is going on in Queen's Park with their provincial cousins in Ontario and that bothers them quite a bit. It is better, in their view, to object to a major investment project that will create thousands of jobs, directly and indirectly, in the maritimes and seem to be defending the ferry workers. We are not doing this because we want to make trouble for workers who earn their living on the ferries. That is not the purpose. Those people will be helped and assisted.

We must look at the whole picture and all the maritime provinces will benefit from this. Every day throughout the country, speeches are made on the importance of the free movement of goods, capital and people. Here we want to encourage the free movement of goods and people with a fixed link between Prince Edward Island and the rest of Canada, but some people oppose it.

Fortunately, there are economic, social and even cultural arguments, and I think that the fixed link in itself will enable many Canadians and foreigners who come to visit us to discover much more easily this gem, Prince Edward Island. Not only Islanders will benefit from this fixed link but many mainlanders will now be able to discover our relatives on the island and see for themselves what makes the Islanders a special people.

Mr. Ghiz, the former premier of Prince Edward Island who is now retired, nevertheless attended the committee meetings to reiterate the importance of this project for the island's economy. I have a lot of respect for Mr. Ghiz; I believe that during his term on Prince Edward Island, he did a lot for his people. He said: "It is for the good of Prince Edward Island, for the good of the region and for the good of Canada". Despite what some would have us believe or what we would tend to think from what they say, the people of Prince Edward Island are Canadians first; they are people from the Atlantic region who want to be proud participants in our country's success.

[*English*]

With reference to the issue of cost, just the cost of doing business will be lower. The P.E.I. trucking industry alone will have annual savings of about $10 million once the bridge opens. There will be no more hours wasted in a line-up waiting for the ferry. The truckers will simply take a 15-minute drive across the bridge.

I am sure the long wait for the ferry has discouraged many tourists from even visiting P.E.I. With the bridge, tourism on the island will surely increase. Even the bridge itself, which will be one of the longest in the world, will be a tourist attraction.

• (1210)

Clearly the economic arguments in favour of this project are convincing. This project will bring direct and indirect, long and short-term benefits to a region of our country that is reaching out for opportunities to revive its economy. Future generations of Atlantic Canadians will be thankful to those who had the foresight to pave the way for such a great undertaking.

I am glad to see our colleagues on the other side of the House in the Liberal Party are supporting this initiative. Notwithstanding their commitment to sustainable development they know we can have economic development

in a sustainable way. I think this bridge will be proof it is possible.

For all of these reasons I will be pleased later today to stand up proudly as an Atlantic Canadian, as a New Brunswicker, as the member of Parliament for Madawaska—Victoria, to vote in favour of the bill.

Mr. Ron MacDonald (Dartmouth): Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure for me to rise today to debate this particular issue at third reading. I would like to do something very unusual and commend my colleague opposite, the Minister of Employment and Immigration, who just spoke in support of the legislation. As a fellow Atlantic Canadian he certainly understands the importance of transportation infrastructure for our economic development.

I also want to give some praise to the Minister of Public Works from Central Nova. He and I have crossed swords many times in the House and in the riding. I cannot in all honesty at the end of this particular session indicate that at least on this occasion he has not had the best interest of Atlantic Canada at heart. He has pursued this project vigorously. He has worked against a lot of odds, I am sure both in his caucus and within the region, to allow this project to go through and have assessments done. It is indeed one of the few projects that may lead to real economic advancement and opportunity in the long term in Atlantic Canada.

I also want to give some credit to a former colleague of ours in this place, the now premier of Prince Edward Island. I remember when the debate first started about a fixed link to Prince Edward Island. Coming from Cape Breton Island I certainly had a lot of interest in the debate that was raging because this project would certainly lead to a significant amount of economic development and infusion of revenue into Atlantic Canada, most particularly Prince Edward Island and I guess New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. as well as many jobs.

I thought Ms. Callbeck, the premier of Prince Edward Island and then member for Malpeque, would have been on her feet quickly to support this proposal but she was not. The minister opposite knows that. Indeed the members from Prince Edward Island decided that before they voiced their opinions there were certain things they wanted to see done, as did the government. Those things by and large have been looked at.

The member from British Columbia would have the Canadian public believe that everybody in Atlantic Canada has been co-opted by the project because it is going to provide a substantial number of jobs during the construction period. It is quite the contrary. With this proposal there was an absolute requirement put forward by both governments, federally and provincially, members of the P.E.I. legislature and members of Parliament from Prince Edward Island, that a number of factors be examined vigorously before they would give their stamp of approval. Early on there was even a plebiscite put forward in Prince Edward Island by then Premier Ghiz to ensure this project would take the province in the direction the people wanted.

I commend all four of my colleagues from Prince Edward Island, one of whom is now premier, for doing the right thing and not doing the expedient thing which was to jump on the band wagon early and try to pass this right away. They understood this proposal would fundamentally change the economy of their part of Atlantic Canada and that the citizens of Prince Edward Island who would be affected the most had to have a say. A lot of process had to be gone through before they would finally put their stamp of approval on this particular project.

• (1215)

We have heard a lot from other people about the processes going back to the time of Confederation. The Charlottetown Conference in 1864 was about maritime union. It evolved into Canadian Confederation. One of the items on the agenda for discussion at that point was transportation and communication: a link from that island, the garden province, to the mainland. They understood there was more to be gained than lost by ending transportation isolation and improving links to the mainland.

In 1864 the leaders and people of Prince Edward Island understood that it was a delicate balance but they had to have modern, convenient and efficient transportation links. When they entered into Confederation in 1873 that was the condition of their joining the union.

We have heard through the debates that it was pretty tough at least in the early days. They had to use ice boats to go across. They would ferry goods, mail and individuals. It was a dangerous crossing even at the best of times

during the winter months. I am sure in the fall gales it must have been pretty precarious as well.

There was talk of a fixed link to Prince Edward Island as early as the 1880s. There was considerable study and a lot of talk done on it. They knew, even over 100 years ago, that the economic well-being of the island would depend on its transportation links to the markets off-island. With the advent of modern hulled ice-breakers it became less of a problem to cross in the winter months and so the idea died for a long period of time.

In the 1960s the Government of Prince Edward Island recognized that if the island's economy was to develop in a planned fashion it had to have better transportation links to the mainland. About 1966 the Government of Prince Edward Island started to develop some approach roads and things like that. They were subsequently stopped after there was a comprehensive development agreement between the Government of Canada and the province of Prince Edward Island.

The idea of a fixed link has gained new currency for a variety of reasons. One reason is that with increasing trade and more people wanting to go to P.E.I. the ferry service has become an impediment to planned growth in Prince Edward Island.

The member for Skeena spoke before and carried on like a raging bull about this project. Somehow he knows better and more than everybody else about the project: those poor illiterates down in P.E.I. do not know what is good for them so the New Democratic Party is going to have to go down there and tell them.

The reason this type of proposal gained currency and had to be examined along with all options around the table was that people like my family and I who now live in Dartmouth would love to be able to go to P.E.I. more often. However, Mr. Speaker, if you have not done it, sometimes in the summertime with all of us off-Islanders trying to get on that beautiful island you can wait in line for hours and hours.

The member for Skeena was playing with words and statistics. He said the members from the Atlantic coast were trying to say the ferry service was unreliable while it has only been late four times in the last *x* number of crossings. We never said the ferry was late. We just said it was hellish hard to get on the ferry. I had to wait for three ferries the last time I went down there. Yes, I would wait again because it is a beautiful island and the people are wonderful. It is a great place to go for a holiday to relax and enjoy the beauty of the island.

The people of Prince Edward Island had a plebiscite and 60 per cent of them said yes to a fixed link. My colleague from Hillsborough indicated in his speech—and I do not know if a poll was done—that closer to 70 per cent of all individuals on Prince Edward Island support a fixed link. That is a lot.

• (1220)

I am pretty offended at the approach the New Democratic Party has taken on this project, particularly the member for Skeena. He sounds more like the member for *Jurassic Park*. He is a dinosaur when it comes to economic development and the type of debate he has engaged in with the slurs he has thrown at members, particularly Atlantic Canadian members, about why we are going forward with this project. It may be his last speech. Perhaps he was prone to an excessive amount of hyperbole but the facts are the facts.

This is not a proposal where we have jumped all over ourselves blindly and said that we should run for it because it is going to give us some badly needed jobs in Atlantic Canada. We did not say that. I do not need somebody from his coast telling somebody from my coast anything about the environment. I do not need anybody from anywhere in Canada telling a member of Parliament, particularly from Prince Edward Island, about the importance of the fishery. I found his comments to be condescending and I found them to be a bit infuriating. Perhaps it was because it may be his last chance to speak in this place.

Let us put it on record. The member for Skeena clearly said that it should never go ahead because there are going to be many problems. There have been more then 90 studies done on the link. There have been 24 studies on the marine aspect of the fisheries impact. There have been 17 studies with regard to the ice problem that might be created. The NDP wants to dismiss every one of the studies that comes forward to debunk what the New Democratic Party says; somehow everybody in the world has been co-opted to get this link

to Prince Edward Island. I did not know the members from P.E.I. were that powerful but surely they are.

There have been nine socio-economic studies. There were four studies with regard to wind. We might want to have another study with regard to wind for the member for Skeena. There have been 10 terrestrial studies and 23 miscellaneous studies by no less than the Atlantic Provinces Economic Council, the Atlantic Geoscience Centre, Coles Associates Ltd., Environment Canada, Geo Consulting Engineers and on and on.

The former premier of Prince Edward Island is no fool. He is no slouch. The former premier understood that his first and foremost responsibility was as a caretaker of the people's interest in Prince Edward Island when he served as its premier. He clearly set out what he called the 10 commandments, which were the 10 concerns he had even after the plebiscite and before he would go forward with the fixed link.

Premier McKenna of New Brunswick certainly has an interest. Northumberland Strait washes on his shores as well. All these studies have been done. The former premier of Prince Edward Island, the current premier of Prince Edward Island, the premier of New Brunswick, the Minister of Public Works, the Minister of Employment and Immigration, the government opposite, everybody has agreed at this time they should proceed with the proposal for a fixed link or bridge from the mainland to Prince Edward Island.

The New Democratic Party keeps telling us that study is not good study. They just want to study it, study it and study it. They sound like the Friends of the Island. The Friends of the Island have come forward on many occasions. They have bellyached, griped and said that the project was going to destroy the fisheries. They said it was going to be an ecological disaster and that we needed studies.

The study was done and it showed they were wrong. They jump on to another one and say the ice is going to be the big problem. Ice studies have been done which indicate that it is not a problem. They jump on to another one and say they had better go to the Federal Court to stop the project. If they were opposing the project based on a solid environmental set of principles I would have more respect for them. I respect their right to disagree.

I will quote from a speech one of my colleagues gave. The Friends of the Island jumped over to the ice issue after finding out about the 10 conditions, the so-called 10 commandments put forward by the premier of P.E.I. before he would put his stamp of approval on the project. The ice report came in and indicated that ice was not a problem. Somebody asked about a panel of internationally acclaimed ice experts debunking the theory that ice was going to be a problem because of the bridge structures. That particular objection by the Friends of the Island was dropped and a new argument took its place.

• (1225)

The Friends of the Island were asked if they would cease to oppose it if a second plebiscite was held and the result supported the bridge. If the people of P.E.I. had to go through the unusual expense of another plebiscite on whether or not they wanted a fixed link and came out again saying that they wanted the fixed link and to get on with business, the spokesperson for Friends of the Island, Cathy Edwards, said they would never go away.

Perhaps the New Democratic Party is in the same boat. It does not want to hear the facts. It does not want to have any fundamental understanding of equalization in the country. Let us get down to the crux of the matter. The New Democratic Party has no federal members in Atlantic Canada and for good reason. The New Democratic Party by the type of activity it has undertaken in opposition to the bill has probably alienated more of its potential supporters than anything we on this side of the House could have done to facilitate that conclusion.

It dismisses the fact that transportation infrastructure is an absolute requirement. It is a prerequisite for economic development. Why should we in Atlantic Canada and in particular the people of Prince Edward Island be denied modern, efficient and environmentally safe transportation links to that island? Why should we? We have gone far too long without the things we need for economic development. We are tired of being on our knees kissing up to a federal government to get welfare payments. We want to become taxpayers, not tax takers. In order to do so projects like the fixed link must go forward. They must go forward after the proper studies have been done. With 90 studies done, what in the name of God do the New Democrats want?

I understand the NDP knows a bit about unemployment. The leader of the New Democratic Party in Prince Edward Island is now on the public payroll, I guess through the unemployment insurance system. He is unemployed. He draws pogey for a living. I would have thought maybe members opposite would have contacted him for one of those thousands of jobs that will be created. Maybe he could shovel some dirt or something and get off pogey. There will be a bit of economic development even for New Democrats on the island and maybe even their leader.

We have engaged in opposition to the bill. Some of the nonsense put forward by the New Democratic Party has to be debunked. In Atlantic Canada we need transportation infrastructure. In Atlantic Canada we have seen our rail lines abandoned. We have an application now to the Minister of Public Works concerning the rail line that goes through his important part of Nova Scotia down to Sydney. There is an application to sell that line to a private short line operator. We are worried about that. It is not because we do not think the short line operator might be able to operate it. We are worried about what will happen if the operator decides not to operate it.

Without modern, efficient, multi-modal transportation we have no economic development in Atlantic Canada. Without a highway system that is efficient and safe we have no economic development. Without an airport system that operates on the basis of equalization of opportunity instead of cost recovery we have no economic development in Atlantic Canada.

We all know that. The Minister of Public Works who is a former economic development minister would know more than most people in the House how important transportation links are to economic growth and development in our part of the country.

This is not a giveaway. The member for Skeena says it is a billion dollar boondoggle. Will he come down and tell that to the people of Prince Edward Island who are suffering from 17 per cent or 18 per cent unemployment, the people in northeastern Nova Scotia where it is 22 per cent or those in southern New Brunswick where it is probably in between those two percentages? Let him tell it to the truckers who have to sit for hours and hours to get a ferry to move their goods to the island. Let him tell it to tourist operators who say that if there were a better way for people to get on the island they could employ five, six, seven or fifteen more people during the summer season.

All those things lead to economic development and wealth and make taxpayers from tax takers. The NDP would have us abandon that. It would have us drop it like a stone. I do not question for an instant that before any project like this one goes ahead there has to be a vigorous and thorough examination of its environmental impact, but that has been done. The NDP is used to being negative and against everything unless it is in its own backyard and in its own electoral interest. It cannot see this is not just another project. This is finally the fulfilment of the requirement and the deal that Prince Edward Island sought when it joined Confederation in 1873.

• (1230)

In 1873 P.E.I. said it would join. Canada gave it a guarantee of efficient transportation and communication links to the mainland. For over a century islanders have suffered from what I think is an inadequate link to the mainland. Some 70 per cent of people on Prince Edward Island who looked at this project said yes to a fixed link after all the environmental assessments were done and after the fishery was looked after. On all those things they have said yes. They said to proceed cautiously but to please proceed.

We are concerned about the fishery. Do not let the New Democratic Party say that the Liberals in Atlantic Canada are not concerned. We have forgotten more about fish than they will ever know in that corner of the House. We are damned concerned about the fishery. That is why the former premier of Prince Edward Island and the new premier of Prince Edward Island demanded those types of studies take place before even one centime of approval was given.

I would ask the New Democrats for once to look after the interests of Canadians and not the narrow, partisan interest of their own party. This is probably the last or the second to last bill that will go through this Parliament before an election is called. This is a bill that will give hope to the entrepreneurs in eastern Canada. This is a bill that will give hope to those who have lost hope because they do not have job creation opportunities. This is a bill that in the long term will allow places like Prince

Edward Island to have what everybody else has, and that is an efficient means of access to markets.

I would conclude by saying I commend members from Prince Edward Island and the minister opposite from Central Nova for their tenacity over the last number of years in moving this agenda item forward carefully, in ensuring all the studies that had to be done have been done and in ensuring all the people who had to be heard were heard. Most of all, in the dying days of this Parliament they ensured this much needed bill for Atlantic Canada was put through.

Ms. Lynn Hunter (Saanich—Gulf Islands): Mr. Speaker, I noted the member indicated in his speech that he invited opposition and debate. Then he went into a 20-minute diatribe against those very things. It is sad that in the last few days of the House the Liberals feel so insecure on this project they cannot take the very valid criticisms put forward by the New Democratic Party.

I have a question for the member. The Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office put forward a recommendation not to proceed after the environmental assessment was done. It recommended not to proceed. The Department of Public Works rejected that recommendation. I would like his comments on that. I would also like his comments on the Federal Court's decision that this would be in contempt of the environmental assessment process.

These are valid concerns. It has nothing to do with electability. It is talking about an environmental assessment review, respect for that process and respect for the judicial process that has been assessed here. I ask him to tone down the rhetoric and get to the points we have been addressing in our comments before the House.

Mr. MacDonald (Dartmouth) Mr. Speaker, it is a bit much to have the member opposite talk about rhetoric after what we have had to listen to from her people on this bill. It is absolutely incredible.

She asked about the concerns of the court. I do not think that by the Parliament of Canada supporting the bill we are in contempt of anything other than the behaviour of the New Democratic Party in not participating in a positive way in its development. That is what I am in contempt of.

I will say that the concerns addressed by the Federal Court in its decision in my view have been adequately addressed both by the Department of Public Works and by the province of Prince Edward Island. We can have debate on this project until the cows come home whether or not the member who asked the question thinks it has been addressed.

• (1235)

I want to say something about the kind of comments that have been made. I do not say this with a great deal of hyperbole. I find the approach of the New Democratic Party on this issue to be condescending and insulting to the 70 per cent of people in Prince Edward Island who are in favour and the hundreds of individuals who have appeared at committees, participated in the studies that have been done, and have provided input over the years. I find the attitude of the New Democratic Party highly insulting. It is basically saying that we, the poor bumpkins down east, just do not know what is good for us. What malarkey. What lies. If there is anybody who is going to be looking after the interests of Atlantic Canadians it is members of this place from Atlantic Canada.

I understand the New Democratic Party and the member opposite have a real interest in the environment, but they have a greater interest at this point in this Parliament in opposing anything that comes forward so they can get more free press. That is all they are interested in.

I am not interested in free press. I am interested in the bill proceeding at this point at the end of the session after a great deal of study through this place so that we in Atlantic Canada, particularly in Prince Edward Island and parts of northeastern Nova Scotia and southern New Brunswick, can finally be on an even playing-field, an even footing, with other regions of the country in terms of the ability to have modern transportation systems and connections between our producers and the Canadian and world marketplaces.

Mrs. Beryl Gaffney (Nepean): Mr. Speaker, I have both a comment and a question. I compliment my colleague from Dartmouth for his impassioned plea to move ahead with Bill C-110 on the Northumberland Strait crossing. I would suppose most people in the House would wonder why I, an Ontario member, would want to bother speaking on the Northumberland Strait crossing.

When P.E.I. joined Confederation my forefathers had landed on P.E.I. in Charlottetown in 1789, long before Prince Edward Island was named Prince Edward Island. It was called the Île St-Jean. I have a long history in

P.E.I. and am well aware of the problems of growing up in that province. I grew up in a little country rural village called North Bedeque, P.E.I. In fact, the current premier of Prince Edward Island, Catherine Callbeck, and I grew up within four miles of each other. She grew up in Central Bedeque and I in North Bedeque.

I can remember the feeling of isolation on P.E.I. and those long winter months. I remember the great joy we felt when the first ice-breaker, *the Abegweit*, was built and ploughed through the ice floes of Northumberland Strait between Cape Tormentine and Borden, P.E.I.

I remember the importance of the railway on the island, and the railway is no longer there. I remember the importance of the rural postmen delivering the mail, and they have largely disappeared. It no longer has the same air links it had in previous years. There has been a tremendous transportation cutback on Prince Edward Island.

Prince Edward Island is the cradle of Confederation and its population is small. It will never be anything but small. With the link it will probably increase.

Something is being missed in the debate this morning, and this is leading up to my question. The studies have been done, as the hon. member for Dartmouth has stated, but if we stop to look at the transfer payments from the federal government to the province of Prince Edward Island we would see that out of every dollar it spends at least 65 cents is coming from the federal coffers.

If the bridge is put through there has to be a tremendous pay-back to the Islanders in terms of a booming economy. The economy will certainly pick up. I am wondering, and the member for Dartmouth might know, whether there have been any studies done to show what increased revenue would be realized for the economy of P.E.I. when the link is completed. We know this link is going to cost slightly under a billion dollars over many years. How much will P.E.I. revenue be increased? There should actually be a drop in the cost to the federal government because of the improved economy which will result in increased revenue. Have any studies been done in that regard?

• (1240)

Mr. MacDonald (Dartmouth): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if there has or has not been. However logic would tell me that when we take a subsidy which certainly will be in existence as long as the ferry service runs and give it to the developer of the fixed link over the period of 35 years then no more money, at least in subsidy, will have to be spent by the federal government than would have been required under the terms of Confederation.

One thing is very clear: Prince Edward Island has some natural advantages. Prince Edward Island produces some of the finest agricultural products, its potatoes, in the world. There is a problem with competitiveness in terms of getting that product to market because when a truck sits at a ferry dock for a number of hours there is a cost factor.

Conversely the other large industry in Prince Edward Island is tourism. In Japan, where I was just recently, everybody knows where Prince Edward Island is. They do not know where anything else is east of Niagara Falls but they do know where P.E.I. is. They know Anne of Green Gables.

In the long term this will lead to increased economic development opportunities which will lead to decreased transfer payments from the federal government. As I mentioned earlier it will allow more to become taxpayers instead of tax takers.

One thing I want to say and which I did not get to say is that I come from Cape Breton Island. Cape Breton Island has had a fixed link since about 1955 or 1953. Somebody will probably call me and say I missed it by a year or so. Cape Breton Island is a fiercely independent place, as are Islanders, and we have a culture and a heritage which we are proud of and which we export for the enjoyment of people all around Canada, perhaps around the world.

Some opponents of the fixed link say that P.E.I. will become less of an island, that it somehow will lose something culturally by the link. We were forcibly annexed to the province of Nova Scotia in 1844 and we were connected to the province of Nova Scotia in the mid-fifties. The spirit, culture and heritage of Cape Breton Island have never been stronger. I am sure that will be the case with Prince Edward Island as well.

Mr. George Proud (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise once again to speak in support of the legislation which will allow the government to enter into an agreement to build a fixed link between Prince Edward Island and the rest of Canada.

As I said a few days ago the time for rhetoric is over. We have said it all and the studies have all been done. Some people think there have not been enough done. We have all heard the numbers. There are probably over a hundred of them. I believe, as do the people of my province, it is time to set this all aside and get on with the job.

I firmly believe that Canadians must always be prepared to move forward and be willing to face the necessary changes if we are going to secure our future. Hon. members will know that the poor economic performance evident across Canada at the present time has been a condition that we have known for many years in Atlantic Canada.

There was a time when Atlantic Canada was at the forefront of world trade and at the very centre of world transportation. Our sailing ships and the crews that manned them were among the greatest in the world. However their time passed. We were prosperous, innovative and at the forefront of the latest technology of the day. We must remember that the path to success in our region can only be reattained if we once again move to the forefront in transportation and technological development.

We are all nostalgic for the slower paced times of years gone by. Many of us continue to attempt to cling to the old ways and the old methods. However in terms of transportation there is no substitute for efficiency and speed. If we are to somehow return to our former prosperity we must have an efficient and reliable transportation system.

I believe that by passing this legislation we will be able to achieve that goal. We will be taking the first step on the road to the economic recovery of our province and our region.

There are tremendous implications to the project both in the short term and in the long term. In the short term thousands and thousands of construction jobs will be created along with the other economic spin-offs that will filter throughout the whole economy during the construction period. There will be opportunities for training and for meaningful and rewarding employment.

• (1245)

When this project is completed it will be, to use a much overused word, world class. It will elicit interest and wonder from around the world. Being built in the particular region of the world that it is and under the conditions which exist, by the time it is completed it will be admired as the standard by which future projects of this nature will be judged.

The people who work on and assemble the bridge will be the ranking experts in their field. I am sure they will have many opportunities to use their expertise and their skills around the world. In the longer term, as I alluded to earlier, the fixed link will remove a bottleneck of transportation to our province, which adds unnecessary expense to the cost of goods coming to P.E.I. and adds great cost to the products we ship to market.

We all realize that tolls will always be with us, but the time the tractor trailer is sitting idle on the wharf in Borden and Cape Tormentine waiting for the ferry will be eliminated. This will cut several hours in transportation time and allow our producers, especially those who are transporting perishable goods, to better schedule their transportation to the marketplace.

This will no doubt have a twofold effect. It will lower the cost of living in Prince Edward Island and will make our products more competitive in the marketplace.

Other factors I briefly mentioned earlier were the whole state of our economy and the feeling of despair which has come into being in much of Atlantic Canada, especially during the last number of years. Perhaps a project of this magnitude when completed will give our people not only an economic shot in the arm but also a shot of confidence which is needed much more. When we have completed this world class megaproject we will be able to face the world with confidence and say that we can create and build as well as anyone.

One of the examples, from a personal perspective, of the extra benefits which will flow from this project is in my own riding of Hillsborough. There will be the building of a bridge across the river in Charlottetown which will connect Charlottetown with the southeastern part of the province. It will go across to Southport,

Bunbury, Keppoch-Kinlock, and that immediate area across the river.

This second bridge has been needed for many years but has been beyond the financial capabilities of the province to build. The construction of the second bridge is part of the conditional agreement to build the link and can be done for about one-half of what it would normally cost because of the expertise and the facilities that will be available as a result of work on the fixed link.

The badly needed addition will be greatly appreciated by the people in my riding and also will be possible as Atlantic Canada and Prince Edward Island become the centre of bridge building technology. The second bridge I talk about is one in an area in which a lot of traffic comes through two or three times a day. It is the main route into the southeastern part of the province.

When special events have taken place in Charlottetown over the years getting traffic moving across this bridge has been people's biggest concern. Some repairs have been recently made to the approach roads and it has made it much easier. Now with the building of this second bridge it will certainly make the travel time much less and reduce the complications when the city of Charlottetown synchronizes its lighting system to make the traffic flow much more efficient.

We have talked about all the studies that were done and studies that needed to be done. I said before that if every project in the country was studied, talked about, looked at and had the public input this one has had over the last number of years, we would not have the many problems with projects in other parts of Canada which we hear about in this House every day. I sincerely believe this.

I have my own concerns about the environment and I have my own concerns about the ferry workers at Marine Atlantic.

• (1250)

These things were all taken into consideration. As I understand it, as far as the ferry workers are concerned negotiations are to take place with the union representing Marine Atlantic. An arrangement has to be reached within the period of time this construction is taking place.

I believe this will be done. I cannot understand why anyone would want to see this happen and not have these people looked after. It was certainly one of my main concerns because these are good and well paying jobs, as has been said here before. They are great employees. A lot of them are long-time employees. Young people growing up knew if they could get a job at the railway—it used to be part of CNR—they could spend the rest of their days there. This has to be done. I know the province is sincerely aware of it and is helping to ensure that arrangements are made with these people.

We talked about the environment. The fishery is probably the only fishery in Canada that is not in trouble in one way or another. No one from that part of the country or any other part of the country would want to go ahead with a project that was going to damage it. We have a great lobster and scallop fishery. All shellfish are taken out of that particular area. It is one of the great lobster fisheries in the province. No one would ever do anything to harm it.

The built-in protection is there. The fishermen and the people involved in the fishery are going to be part of a trust that administers this $10 million fund that has been set up. These things have been taken care of.

We have all had our concerns over the last number of years since this came on the scene and until the plebiscite was held. I remember concerns were voiced when I was going door to door in the last election campaign. We did not hear very many but there were some people who had concerns. There are people who are never going to change their minds about it for their own reasons, and that is fair.

I firmly believe we have to move ourselves down that road in the transportation area to have a more efficient mode to get our goods to market and bring products into Prince Edward Island. I believe this and I am firmly convinced.

Premier Callbeck has been around the country talking with companies in the hope that they are going to move their operations into Prince Edward Island. This link will help them make the decision whether or not to set up there. They have to have some assurance they can leave with their products 24 hours a day.

This is also needed at the present time to spur on the economy that has been in the doldrums for the last number of years. This will be a big project for Atlantic

Canada. It is a billion dollar project. It is going to create an awful lot of work for labourers and trades people.

We say it will change the way of life in Prince Edward Island. I assume our parents and grandparents in their own ways tried to make our province and our country a bit better for the generations that came behind them. I am convinced. I know there is the feeling now that it may take away our status as an island but I do not believe it. We will continue to be the independent people we have always been.

My colleague from Dartmouth spoke about connecting Cape Breton to mainland Nova Scotia by a causeway some years ago. It certainly has not changed the nature of the people in that province regarding whether or not they are Islanders. I do not have the fear some people seem to have that it is going to drastically change our way of life. If it changes our way of life I am convinced it is going to change it for the better.

My colleague from Nepean spoke about the small population. Yes, we have a small population. One of the efforts we have to put forward is to have more people maintain permanent residence on Prince Edward Island. We could easily maintain three times the population we have now. That is something this will also help to accomplish.

• (1255)

I know people from the other maritime provinces say they would like to go over to Prince Edward Island on the weekends in the summertime but they are apprehensive about driving to Pictou or Cape Tormentine because of the line-ups.

I think we have done what is necessary. Quite likely there is always more that can be done. However I am sure as this project goes forward the monitoring systems will be in place to make sure all the environmental issues and the fishery problems are met and will be monitored daily.

The economic impact this is going to have in Prince Edward Island as well as in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia is going to be phenomenal. It is going to be one of the major items to take place since Prince Edward Island came into Confederation.

We have talked about this project and studied it. We have had committee meetings and public meetings in Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. If there is anything that has not been done I do not know what it is. There will be those who will argue that the court's demands have not been totally met, but according to the decisions we have seen and the information we have been given these demands have been met.

The next logical step is to pass this bill. Then Public Works Canada can get everything rolling and SCI can begin building its marshalling yard. This in itself is a $65 million project which is certainly going to spur things on for the short term.

We have come to the end of the day on this matter. Let us vote on it and move it further down the road.

Mr. Joe McGuire (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Hillsborough for his very good speech and his excellent comments.

I would like to ask him, as a past minister of labour in the province of Prince Edward Island, about his views on the support in Prince Edward Island from the labour sector. Some comments have been made in the House that labour really does not support the project. As he has indicated, there are going to be some job losses in the ferry system.

My colleague and I have been quite active with various groups in Prince Edward Island over the past number of months and years. I would like the member to give us his comments on how labour views this project.

Mr. Proud: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Egmont for his questions. Labour in Prince Edward Island is a divided house. There are those on the side of the Ferry Workers Union who are opposed to this going ahead, but not all of the Federation of Labour is divided in its support.

I believe, as I said a few moments ago, that no stone can be left unturned in the negotiations with these people to have a package, whether they will go to new jobs, are retrained for other jobs, are transferred or go to early retirement. That has to take place.

The other part of the trade union movement, the trades people, the crafts people, the Canadian Federation of Labour group, is fully in support of this project because it knows it is the key that will spur on the economy in Atlantic Canada. It will make a lot of work for its employees because it represents all the trades.

There are also groups within the Federation of Labour that are in support of the project.

With all the things taken into consideration the labour movement will support this project because it is where the jobs are going to come from for the next number of years. As I understand it those in the Federation of Labour opposed to it are concerned it is going to take away these jobs from the marine Atlantic workers. That is a very legitimate fear.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I guess the House is not ready for the question as yet.

It being one o'clock p.m. I do now leave the chair until two o'clock p.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(2).

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 31

[*English*]

WETASKIWIN

Mr. Willie Littlechild (Wetaskiwin): Madam Speaker, this is probably my last opportunity to address Parliament. I would like to express my gratitude for the great honour and blessing I have had to serve Canada and the constituency of Wetaskiwin. I wish to thank my wife Helen and my children, Teddi, Neil and Megan, who have supported my decision and have helped me throughout the past five years.

To all the constituents of Wetaskiwin, the Four Nations of Hobbema, who sent me here to represent them I can truly say that I did my best. I give thanks for the privilege of working with all members and staff of this Parliament. They are all winners. Whether it was here, in caucus or in committees I learned from all of them.

To Emily Lank, Doug McLeod, Michele Larose and all others who worked with me I give my sincere thanks. On behalf of all my people, I would like to thank the outgoing Prime Minister and all my Alberta and national caucus colleagues.

Last, I give my sincere congratulations to our new Prime Minister, Kim Campbell. May the great spirit bless and guide her.

GASOLINE REGULATIONS

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Madam Speaker, the Minister of the Environment must have been busy elsewhere when government regulations to ban leaded gasoline were reversed and leaded gasoline was allowed for racing cars in Canada.

The decision sets a dangerous precedent and is wrong. First of all, lead endangers human health. Second, the decision weakens the Canadian Environmental Protection Act. Third, it deals a serious blow to the Canadian unleaded fuel industry, which creates environmentally friendly jobs in Canada.

This decision should be reversed because it is a step backwards. We urge the Minister of the Environment to reverse his decision and protect the health of Canadians.

* * *

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona): Madam Speaker, I am greatly disturbed by a couple of things going on at CN right now. As an MP from Winnipeg I have raised the issue of job losses at CN many times in the past, particularly with respect to the erosion of Winnipeg as a regional centre for CN.

This erosion unfortunately continues. CN now seems to be shutting down its medical and first aid departments in Winnipeg, moving files to Edmonton and contracting out what remains to be done in Winnipeg in these departments.

Long-term dedicated employees are being forced to take so-called voluntary retirement and also being forced to signed waivers releasing CN from any further obligations of any kind arising out of their employment with CN.

This is unfair to Winnipeg and unfair to the employees involved. I call on the Minister of Transport to look into the matter and do something about it.

* * *

POVERTY

Ms. Barbara Greene (Don Valley North): Madam Speaker, I have some questions for the opposition. Liberals want to institutionalize and fund food banks,

national school lunch programs and other demeaning ways of helping the poor.

Do they think welfare mothers will not feed their children when they have an adequate income? Do they think Canadian mothers want the government to take over their role in nurturing their children? Are our children not to have the special treats we make them and our care and attention in ensuring they have food they like and that will help them to grow healthy and feel loved?

Why do they want a poverty line that does not count income people receive or deduct income people do not have? Why do they want to mislead the Canadian public?

Why does the member for York West want the same numbers for Toronto as Winnipeg? Does he not know that it costs more to live in Toronto?

Do they think Canadian taxpayers have money to give away to people whether they need it or not? Why do they want to help the greedy and let poor children suffer?

* * *

• (1405)

JUSTICE

Mr. Maurizio Bevilacqua (York North): Madam Speaker, it is an unfortunate reality that Canadians no longer feel safe. They feel threatened at school, on the street and even in their homes.

Since 1984 Canada has seen a 40 per cent increase in violent crime, multiple murders in Montreal, gangs waging war in Toronto and knives and guns in schools across the nation. These are all symptoms of a society in decline. Canadians want to halt that decline and they want it halted now.

The Liberal Party has proposed a bold and comprehensive package of proposals for combating Canada's growing crime problem. The Liberal plan includes, among other measures, developing the category of dangerous young offender for some repeat youth offenders, which would involve stiffer sentencing in adult courts; the transfer of certain sex offenders to secure mental facilities after they have served their sentences and measures to facilitate the removal of a man from the home in cases of violence against women and children.

For the millions of Canadians who fear for their safety the Liberal crime and justice proposal—

Madam Deputy Speaker: I am sorry but the member's time has expired.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CREDIT CARDS

Mr. Marcel R. Tremblay (Québec–Est): Madam Speaker, this week the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs released its latest quarterly report about credit card charges. In this report consumers are warned about the cost involved in using credit cards in order to help them select and use credit cards wisely.

As the summer season approaches, consumers should also remember to take additional precautions when using their credit cards and always make sure they are kept in a safe place. A person's holidays may be ruined if his or her cards are stolen, and in the end, all consumers pay for these thefts.

I would therefore urge all Canadian consumers to get a copy of this publication at their nearest Consumer and Corporate Affairs office. Don't leave home without it.

* * *

[*English*]

SHELLFISH INDUSTRY

Mr. Joe McGuire (Egmont): Madam Speaker, once again the Department of Fisheries and Oceans is threatening the closure of the fishing station in Ellerslie, P.E.I. and jeopardizing the well–being of the shellfish industry in the area.

Given the over–all state of the fishery in Atlantic Canada I find it incredible that DFO would now start to play games in a sector that is not only reasonably healthy but also has potential for considerable growth.

An aquaculture development program, which is a co–operative effort by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, the P.E.I. Department of Fisheries and the P.E.I. Shellfish Association, is making great progress.

The program's main objective is to increase shellfish production in the public fishery using enhancement techniques in areas of high potential for increased

natural production. It would be tragic if this program were to die because of the short-sightedness of DFO.

The costs of operating the station are low and the returns to the local economy are high. In addition to its contribution to the shellfishery the research station also provides jobs for over 50 people in an area that already has high unemployment.

It is inconceivable that DFO would abandon a program which is making such a significant contribution to an industry which we do have the capability to influence for the greater good.

I ask the minister to scrap—

Madam Deputy Speaker: The member's time has expired.

* * *

GOVERNMENT OF ONTARIO

Hon. Alan Redway (Don Valley East): Madam Speaker, the Prime Minister designate intends to convene an immediate meeting of provincial premiers aimed at achieving a common national economic strategy. This is absolutely essential.

In February 1992 the federal government cut personal income taxes in order to increase consumer spending, stimulate the economy and create jobs. Two months later the Ontario NDP government raised personal income taxes, thus nullifying the federal job creation initiative.

This year the Ontario NDP increased taxes yet again by a further $2 billion. Every $40,000 tax increase wipes out one job. The 1993 Ontario NDP tax increases will wipe out 50,000 jobs. With 10.7 per cent unemployment in Ontario this is absolutely insane. The Ontario NDP must get its act together and realize that Canada desperately needs a common national economic strategy.

Audrey, for Heaven's sake, please reason with the Ontario New Democrats.

* * *

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Cid Samson (Timmins—Chapleau): Madam Speaker, when Bill C-113 was being discussed I offered to table a leaked document which provided guidelines on the application of just cause arguments for quitting a job.

Today I have the official document that will guide the decisions made by agents who will ultimately unfairly reject thousands of UI claimants' attempts to receive benefits. Again, as then, there are buts attached to every just cause in this latest version of the "but book".

The document lists what it calls reasonable alternatives, which are really the government's escape clauses to get out of paying benefits. The minister of unemployment has created a situation in which injustice will occur on a daily basis in Employment and Immigration centres across the country. The minister must reverse this legislation.

* * *

• (1410)

GREAT LAKES

Mr. Ken James (Sarnia—Lambton): Madam Speaker, the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River need careful planning. As finite resources these waterways must readily serve the generations to come.

Regretfully, the recent recommendations of the International Joint Commission's levels reference study failed to meet that need. The six-year old study ought to have produced regulatory plans to address the concerns of riparians and allow them to stay on the shore. However, all of these plans were rejected by the study board.

A constituent of mine, Mr. Duncan McCracken, chairman of the Great Lakes Coalition, submitted a three lakes plan, which was also rejected.

Shoreline property owners were not happy with the terms of reference of the IJC study or its recommendations. This study has only managed to "teach riparians not to park their homes on the lakes".

The IJC should not accept this study and it should be sent back to the committee with a new chairperson. A workable regulatory plan is needed and required.

* * *

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mrs. Beryl Gaffney (Nepean): Madam Speaker, the United Nations and the European Community have denounced human rights violations by a repressive government in Sudan dominated by fundamentalists who

seek to impose Islamic law on the Christians living in the southern part of the country.

For nearly ten years Sudan has been torn by war between its largely Arab and Muslim north and its African and Christian south. In the past decade a million people have died in the south.

Canada's position on enhancing the relations with other countries of the world must be influenced by the values Canadians believe in. Freedom of expression, socio-economic participation and personal dignity are inherent human rights and all individuals who are free to exercise these rights have a moral obligation to support those who do not.

Human rights have no borders and any relations the Canadian government has with Sudan, and indeed all countries, must be considered in this context.

* * *

AIRLINE INDUSTRY

Mr. Jack Shields (Athabasca): Madam Speaker, Air Canada, headed by Hollis Harris, has done everything in its power to destroy Canadian competition in the airline industry.

Air Canada has applied to the cabinet to overturn the ruling of the National Transportation Agency, claiming that cabinet should not allow American Airlines to purchase a share of Canadian Airlines while at the same time Air Canada has bailed out the bankrupt Continental Airlines in the United States. Hollis Harris then calls for re-regulation of the airline industry in Canada. Is he also advocating re-regulation in the United States? Hollis Harris and Air Canada want a monopoly on air service to Canadians. Air Canada does not want competition.

I urge all members of Parliament in this House and the cabinet to give a resounding no to Hollis Harris and Air Canada and tell him to get on with the business of running an airline, negotiate Canadian out of Gemini and allow competition to flourish in Canada as it does in his home country, the United States.

* * *

PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. George Proud (Hillsborough): Madam Speaker, I rise today in the midst of perhaps the most important debate involving the province of Prince Edward Island since we joined Canada in 1873. The construction of a fixed link between P.E.I. and New Brunswick will bring extra benefits to many Islanders.

Included in this is the construction of a new Hillsborough River bridge in my riding. The bottleneck between Charlottetown on the one side of the river and the communities of Bunbury, Southport and Keppoch-Kinlock on the other is aggravating and unsafe, to say the least.

A second bridge has been needed for years but the province has been unable to meet the financial requirements for its construction. However one of the conditions for the construction of a fixed link is that a new bridge spanning the Hillsborough River will be built at about one-half of what it would normally cost, a result of the expertise and facilities made available to the province as a result of the work on the link.

The addition of a new Hillsborough River bridge will be a great asset to my riding and will be appreciated by not only those in my riding but the thousands of people who use that bridge on a daily basis, be it going to work, shopping or visiting friends.

A new Hillsborough River bridge is just one of the ways Islanders will benefit from the construction of a fixed link and I urge members in this House to unanimously support this bill.

* * *

CONSERVATIVE PARTY

Mr. Garth Turner (Halton—Peel): Madam Speaker, I would like to say a couple of words about an incredible experience that I had last weekend. As we all know, the Progressive Conservative Party held its leadership convention and I was honoured and privileged to be one of five candidates at that convention.

I would like to thank my party for affording me the opportunity of doing that. I would like to thank the Prime Minister and my caucus colleagues for their support and their encouragement. I would even like to thank some members of the opposition who I went to for advice and who also encouraged me in this task.

I would like to pay tribute to the other candidates and those supporters who worked tirelessly for them. I would like to congratulate the new Prime Minister designate and tell her that she has my complete support as this government heads toward its third consecutive majority this fall. I would like to finally say that true victory for me has come in the knowledge that when we stand up and

say what Canadians want to hear that they will actually respond in the incredible fashion they have for me.

• (1415)

I would like to say that I have more faith now in this party and this country than at any point before.

* * *

EDUCATION

Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—St. Clair): Madam Speaker, why does the Secretary of State have a national advisory group on student financial assistance? It is a committee that has been completely ignored by her. Alarmed by new financial arrangements with the banks, by lack of information on new needs assessment rules, by new minimum course loads, by effects on part-time students and by implications to accessibility and affordability of government plans, the group took the unprecedented step of calling its own meeting only to be told that the department's plan still cannot be revealed.

A year ago the Council of Ministers of Education also criticized the government's inaction and lack of consultation. The advisory group has demanded a meeting with the Secretary of State to end the impasse for the benefit of students.

She should get off of her duff and be there. Not to do so would be inexcusable.

* * *

[*Translation*]

THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY

Mr. Nic Leblanc (Longueuil): Madam Speaker, the Conservatives put on a terrific show last Friday to commemorate their great successes, and managed to delude themselves and raise false hopes among the Canadian public. In 1984, the Conservatives had three main goals: national reconciliation, which failed twice—Meech and Charlottetown; decentralization of powers—in Charlottetown, it was proposed that all powers be given to Ottawa, with some delegation to the provinces: another failure; the national debt was $180 billion, and today it is $565 billion: failure number three. This proves the system is not working and should be changed as soon as possible.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

FEDERAL ELECTION

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Acting Prime Minister.

During her campaign for the leadership of the Conservative Party, the outgoing minister of defence and the Prime Minister elect said she would call an election sooner rather than later.

The outgoing Prime Minister said just three weeks ago that a Prime Minister that has not been elected is, and I quote, "unacceptable". In 1984 he also said that a government in its fifth year has no mandate.

Last weekend 3,000 Conservatives unanimously endorsed the economic direction of the Michael Wilson–Brian Mulroney years.

My question for the Prime Minister is: When are they going to give 27 million Canadians a chance to have their say about this government's devastating economic policies?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance): Madam Speaker, I am sure that an election will occur at an appropriate time.

What I have noticed again across the way are some nervous Nellies and some cry-babies and so we have to watch that for a while.

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Madam Speaker, the only nervous Nellies are the people on the opposite side of the House who do not have the guts to call an election.

[*Translation*]

Three weeks ago, the Prime Minister said it was unacceptable for a minister who had not been elected to fail to seek and obtain the confidence of Canadians. We know that last weekend the machine selected their candidate. When will the government gave Canadians a chance to do likewise?

[*English*]

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance): Madam Speaker, I did not call the Liberal members nervous Nellies. It was her own leader

who called the members of the Liberal Party nervous Nellies. He called a few of them cry-babies as well.

As the hon. member knows there is a constitutional requirement to hold an election and an election will be held in 1993.

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Madam Speaker, my question is once again for the Deputy Prime Minister.

Three weeks ago his colleague the outgoing Prime Minister said, that it was unacceptable that a Prime Minister that has not obtained the confidence of the people would move on issues like appointments.

I would like to ask the Deputy Prime Minister whether he still shares the view expressed by his own colleague three weeks ago that a Prime Minister who has not received a mandate from the people does not have the moral right to govern.

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance): Madam Speaker, at least the last vote that was taken in this House clearly demonstrates that the Prime Minister and this government have the confidence of this Chamber and that is reflective of the confidence that is held and transferred to the people who represent Canadians from coast to coast.

• (1420)

Very clearly the Prime Minister and this government continue to have the confidence of the House. He and this government have a responsibility to discharge and the new leader elect will have a responsibility to discharge including that of calling an election. I hope the hon. member will be ready.

* * *

GOVERNMENT APPOINTMENTS

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Madam Speaker, I am wondering whether the Deputy Prime Minister will be running.

My question is for the Acting Prime Minister. Canadians all know the Prime Minister's profound indignation to patronage as witnessed in 1984 when he qualified political appointments as "a fraud, a deceit and a sham".

Now that the Prime Minister is no longer the leader of his party and given that this successor has no mandate from the people, will the government commit itself today to placing a freeze on all Order in Council appointments until after the next election? If not, why not?

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance): Madam Speaker, on November 21, 1988 this party, this Prime Minister and this government were given a mandate for five years. We have gone through a leadership change and when that transition takes places and at an appropriate time an election will be called. I just hope hon. members opposite are ready.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Madam Speaker, with respect the minister has failed to answer the question.

[*Translation*]

I would like to put the following question to the Deputy Prime Minister and give him another chance to answer the specific question. Since Christmas the Prime Minister has made more than 600 Order in Council appointments to various positions, including Rinaldo, the hairdresser; the hairdresser's wife; the children's nanny; the speech writer; the barman at the Ritz, and now, the party's fundraiser. Canadians have had enough. They want to know whether the Deputy Prime Minister is prepared to tell us today they will put a freeze on all Order in Council appointments, effective immediately, until the next election. If not, why not?

[*English*]

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, I think what Canadians have had enough of is the hon. member slandering Canadians. He seems to feel, as he keeps repeating, that a successful small businessman is an unfit director of the Federal Business Development Bank and a person with a masters in public administration from Harvard is unfit to serve on the Standards Council.

I wonder how he explains as he rationalizes and apologizes for the fact that on March 26, 1979, the day the writ was issued, the Trudeau government made 91 appointments and continued to make appointments all throughout the election period. The hon. member should consider that before he gets indignant.

Oral Questions

RAIL TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport.

Last Monday the National Transportation Agency began hearings in Sydney into the sale of the Truro to Sydney line. Last Friday CN and CP started the legal process to consolidate the operations in the Ottawa valley including the abandonment of one of the two main lines. Yesterday in Saint John the NTA began the process of hearing CP's application to get out of Atlantic Canada entirely.

All of these are going forward in the absence of a national transportation policy and at the very least in the absence of a national rail network having been decided upon. Is the Minister of Transport now prepared to have a moratorium on the National Transportation Agency so that no further main line applications will be heard until such time as a national rail network has been established?

Hon. Jean Corbeil (Minister of Transport): Madam Speaker, both railway companies have been experiencing many losses over the last few years. I think we should commend both railway companies for having addressed the system to rationalize their operations in order to make sure that there will be rail transportation over the years.

They are utilizing the disposition of the legislation and addressing themselves to the NTA to have the right to abandonment. The NTA is hearing presentations like the member has made. I think it is a very democratic process. At the end of the day it will make the decision. Even when it makes the decision it is not abandonment immediately. It has to be reviewed by the Department of Transport, so I think the process is following its due course.

• (1425)

Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan): Madam Speaker, a supplementary. When Parliament passed the National Transportation Act in 1987 Parliament did not consider that the act it was passing was dealing with the question of main line abandonments. In fact the government concurred because since then the government has not used its power in section 159(3) of the act to prescribe regulations describing how main line abandonments should occur.

I want to again ask the minister: In the absence of a clear government policy and the fact that the railways are in financial trouble, although at the same time the reality is that they are rolling up the tracks faster than they can repair them, will the minister issue a moratorium not forever, but just until such time as a national rail network has been established? He knows his own committee has been working on it for 18 months now. Will he put in place a moratorium and set a deadline to get it done?

Hon. Jean Corbeil (Minister of Transport): Madam Speaker, the hon. member knows that in addition to the Standing Committee on Transport that is examining this situation we have had a report from the review commission of the NTA. We also have a report from the Royal Commission on Passenger Transportation. The Department of Transport with the Transport Association of Canada has been examining this. At the same time the NTA is reviewing the applications from both railways.

At the end of the day these will all come to a conclusion and we will address the question at that time. At the present time there is no fire in the house.

Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan): Madam Speaker, my final supplementary is for the same minister. The minister knows full well that CN and CP are currently examining the future of the rail industry east of Winnipeg. It is entirely likely that this summer they will announce their intention to abandon one of the main lines connecting Winnipeg through Thunder Bay, through northwestern Ontario to eastern Canada.

We are not just talking about the railways' bottom line. We are talking about hundreds, if not thousands of communities. We are talking about tens of thousands of workers. In fact we are talking about whether regions of this country will be connected to the rest of Canada.

Will the minister finally show some leadership and instruct the NTA not to accept any further applications until this mess can be sorted out by the national government, not by the railways?

Hon. Jean Corbeil (Minister of Transport): Madam Speaker, I repeat again that there are a number of courses that are being followed at the present time. The process is going through properly and at the end of the

day when we have all these reports we will be able to determine what is in the best interest of the transportation industry in Canada.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BOSNIA

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Yesterday, the UN Secretary–General tabled a report requesting more troops and equipment for Bosnia. The Minister of National Defence said two weeks ago that Canada did not have enough soldiers. Meanwhile, the Prime Minister said exactly the opposite. Now that the minister has had a chance to examine all the options, I would like to ask whether she is going to send more forces to Bosnia. Are we going to change the mandate of the troops that are over there? What concrete steps have been taken to properly equip our soldiers to guarantee their safety under this new UN mandate?

Hon. Barbara McDougall (Secretary of State for External Affairs): First of all, Madam Speaker, there is no difference between what was said by the Minister of National Defence, the Prime Minister or myself. We are examining our military and financial resources so that we can make our contribution in Yugoslavia as we have done since the beginning of the war.

Yesterday, the Secretary–General's report was put before the Security Council. I have not yet seen the report, but I will examine it as soon as I get it. Meanwhile we have made a decision concerning the feasibility of sending more soldiers or other Canadian military forces. I talked to my international colleagues last week in Luxembourg and we are still looking at the possibilities.

• (1430)

[*English*]

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre): Madam Speaker, a supplementary. For months now we have heard from the Minister of National Defence and the Secretary of States for External Affairs that Canada does not have enough resources to provide more contributions than the peacekeeping.

This morning the minister of defence authorized the expenditure of $60 million for anti–tank missiles, even though the United Nations Secretary–General in his list of equipment that was put forward as requested for Bosnia does not include any of that kind of equipment.

When are we going to stop making these *ad hoc* decisions in defence policy? When will we have a clear cut rationale on how our scarce resources will be used? Why is there not a clear definition of how Canada will undertake a new peacemaking role to meet the crisis the United Nations faces today around the world?

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, reading from a press release: "The Minister of National Defence today announced the awarding of a $5.4 million contract to the French firm Aerospatiale in respect to the anti–armour missile system".

This is dated July 6, 1992. It is hardly today. It is a year ago. It is in the defence policy and if the hon. member thinks about it a little bit, anti–armour weapons are precisely the kind of things peacekeepers need to protect themselves.

* * *

FISHERIES

Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans.

When the minister of fisheries announced a compensation program for those affected by the northern cod moratorium, the government moved quickly to put assistance into the hands of those who needed it. Yet a similar assistance program for fishermen and for fish plant workers along the Gulf of St. Lawrence appears to be stillborn. In the seven weeks since the minister announced the gulf program, not a single fish plant or a single fisherperson on the great northern peninsula has been designated for assistance.

Given there is little or no cod in many communities, given that lobster landings are down by 50 per cent, given that there is no capelin and, therefore, no income for thousands of fishermen and plant workers, what is this minister going to do to kick start this gulf compensation program and get assistance into the hands of those who desperately need it?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency): Madam Speaker, the program that was announced for Atlantic fisheries assistance is well under way.

To date there have been 458 applications received from fisherpersons. There have been 1,199 applications received from plant workers. There are 397 applications approved for plant workers, 161 approved for fishermen throughout the area and more coming in every day. I think 43 plants have been designated.

The nature of this program is such that it can only commence when some plant worker who cannot get a job this year is no longer receiving UI and cannot get their job back or a fisherman or fisherwoman discovers that there are no fish for them to catch. They should then put in an application and if they are qualified, they go on a job creation project. Job creation projects have started.

Contrary to a report from the questioner's colleague, the application forms have not had to be changed. The application forms have been improved. There has been no gap in the availability of them.

Mr. Peterson: Time.

Mr. Crosbie What is the hon. gentleman calling time for? Why do they ask these questions if they do not want to hear the answers?

Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte): Madam Speaker, the minister says the program is well under way, but not a single fish plant or a single fisherman on the great northern peninsula has been designated.

Members of the House should know that as of May 15 there has been absolutely no income by way of fishery, no income from UI, no income from welfare and no income from federal assistance available to any fish plant worker or fisherman on the great northern peninsula. The situation is becoming desperate for many families.

• (1435)

What will the minister do to kick start this program, to get people moving in the department of fisheries and the department of employment and to get assistance into the hands of those who are in desperate need of help right now.

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency): Mr. Speaker, apparently the hon. gentleman is not listening.

On the great northern peninsula there are a number of people already found eligible to receive assistance under the northern cod program. They are receiving assistance.

A fisherman could not receive assistance until after May 15 because that is when the period for UI runs out. They can only be found eligible for assistance now if they cannot find any fish during this fishing season, at which time they will be found eligible for job projects.

The same is true of workers. We have 44 plants designated, a total of 3,840 workers eligible, including Eric King Fisheries Ltd., Compak Seafoods, Long Range Seafood, Burnt Islands, Rose Blanche and Isle aux Morts, all at the bottom part of the west coast of Newfoundland.

The great northern peninsula will be handled as the need arises. I can assure the hon. gentleman that as the need arises they will be served now that he has indicated his approval.

* * *

PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. Steve Butland (Sault Ste. Marie): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Public Works. It is the issue of the Sault Ste. Marie canal and its lock. It was once an international navigational link but has not been operational for six years.

I appreciate the minister's involvement to this point in his ongoing discussions to rehabilitate the lock, including a visit to the site. But this Parliament's time is running out and the project remains in limbo.

Can the minister give any indication whether the project is any closer to completion?

Hon. Elmer M. MacKay (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, the member is quite right. About six years ago Fenco Engineers Inc. indicated the serious nature of the repairs that were required to fix this historic part of Canada's infrastructure.

The member and I share a common interest in trying to do something to rehabilitate this historic canal. As he knows, public works is supportive and I am supportive but we require some assistance from other ministries. I

will give him my undertaking to continue to explore this. As he said, we do not have a lot of time left in this Parliament but perhaps we can accomplish something in the next little while. I will do my best.

Mr. Steve Butland (Sault Ste. Marie): Madam Speaker, it is a good answer.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Butland: My supplemental is for the Minister of Public Works.

I have some indication from the office of the Minister of the Environment that he is in favour of the project. I have received a letter from the Minister of State (Small Businesses and Tourism) that he supports the project. The Ontario government has committed $5.9 million to a federal project. The city of Sault Ste. Marie will maintain the site after the repair of the lock.

Will the minister continue to work with the Minister of the Environment in order that a federal proposal for the repair of the lock can finally be brought forward before this government's mandate runs completely out?

Hon. Elmer M. MacKay (Minister of Public Works): Madam Speaker, I will give my colleague my undertaking that this multi-purpose, multi-faceted, multi-dimensional project will continue to the best of my ability, working with my colleagues. We will do the best we can.

* * *

PENSIONS

Mr. Greg Thompson (Carleton—Charlotte): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare and concerns the length of time it takes for appeals of disability pensions to be reviewed.

In the last two years that process has gone from a waiting period of about four months to somewhere close to one year. I think members on all sides of the House would agree with me that no one has shown more concern for disabled Canadians than our minister but this waiting period concerns all of us.

I was wondering if the process is being reviewed or something can be done to speed it up because these are the neediest of all Canadians. The anguish and frustration has to be dealt with.

Mr. Foster: Maurice Chevalier.

An hon. member: Sing the blues.

Mrs. Campbell (South West Nova): *Chantez.*

• (1440)

Madam Deputy Speaker: I am sure all hon. members, like myself, want to hear what the minister has to say. The hon. minister.

Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Madam Speaker, I know that my colleagues will be disappointed but I said my singing career was over immediately after Friday night. I will just answer one of the best questions that we have had in the House today about disability pension applications.

I share the frustration of my colleague because we have had an ever-increasing number of CPP disability applications. This year we are trying to train more people in a short time to deal with the problem.

I want to say to my colleague that the problem will be fixed and a long-term solution will be found within the review of the income security program in redesigned projects which will fundamentally change the way we do business with the Canada Pension Plan in the department.

If the member and those who refer matters to him want to express some patience, this will be fixed within the next year to the satisfaction of all Canadians.

* * *

SMALL BUSINESSES LOANS ACT

Mr. George S. Rideout (Moncton): Madam Speaker, my question is for the minister of small business.

The government and banks have been in cahoots in a double-speak PR scheme. For small business, venture capital is next to impossible to come by and the Small Businesses Loans Act has little effect. The old way of doing banking is still the order of the day. Since 1989 loans to small business have decreased by 11 per cent and loans to big business have risen by 11 per cent.

When is the government going to forget the baloney and come up with the bucks?

Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister for Science and Minister of State (Small Businesses and Tourism)): Madam Speaker, my hon. friend's question might have been appropriate 10 years ago, but if he had been with me last week when we went to see the bankers' association he would have been pleased with the increased performance under the SBLA program, a program in which we have limited the banks. They cannot take any more than a 25 per cent personal guarantee against an SBLA loan.

This has totally changed the climate. Small businesses now are applying for this in greater numbers and we expect two or three times more business under the new SBLA than under the old one.

The Minister of Finance in his last budget and also in the December statement brought forward all sorts of new possibilities for equity investment in small business, especially in allowing RRSPs to be used in new and creative ways for equity investment in small business. This government, both on the equity and debt side for small and medium enterprises, has been giving leadership across a whole range of areas and will continue with that in the next few months.

Mr. George S. Rideout (Moncton): Madam Speaker, another load of baloney, but my question is for the same minister.

Small business owners are getting calls from their bankers telling them that their lines of credit have been cut in half. Women entrepreneurs looking to start businesses in the new knowledge based economy are being frozen out of loans. The government obviously does not understand the demands on small business.

When will the government stop winking and nodding at the banks and compel them to finance the backbone of this country: small business?

Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister for Science and Minister of State (Small Businesses and Tourism)): Madam Speaker, it is wonderful to hear that the Liberal Party finally, on the second last day of the session, has discovered small business.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Marchi: The next minister of big business.

Mr. Hockin: Almost every minister in this government is working on one program or another to help small business. We are very proud of what we have been able to accomplish.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Hockin: Does the hon. member want to listen to the answer?

Madam Deputy Speaker: Members are asking questions. I think courtesy should be given while the minister is answering. The hon. member from South West Nova may not get the answer she wants but an answer is given and should be listened to.

Mr. Hockin: Madam Speaker, I do not like to be provocative but you just heard Liberals being very childish. In fact they are childish in their whole approach to small business.

The only creative idea they have ever come up with is to criticize the banks. I criticize the banks on many accounts too, especially in their approach to small business. We have more to say than simply to criticize. We have taken positive action and the performance of the Small Businesses Loans Act is the best example of that.

* * *

PORT OF HALIFAX

Mr. Ron MacDonald (Dartmouth): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport.

For five years the government through its fiscal and transportation policies has driven business away from the port of Halifax causing millions of dollars in traffic and hundreds of jobs to be lost.

• (1445)

Now that the new premier of Nova Scotia, John Savage, has made the competitiveness of the port of Halifax his top priority, will the Minister of Transport do the same and finally address the regressive taxation and transportation policies that have crippled Canada's east coast ports?

Hon. Jean Corbeil (Minister of Transport): Madam Speaker, I am happy that the new premier has decided to follow the example of the port of Halifax which has put a team together over the past few years which has

searched for new business. The future of the port of Halifax is in securing new business for it. All the infrastructure and proper sources are there for it to become successful.

Mr. Ron MacDonald (Dartmouth): Madam Speaker, my supplementary question is for the same minister.

Yesterday literally the first order of business of the new government and the new premier of Nova Scotia was for he and his senior cabinet to meet with backers of a private sector proposal which could see the port of Halifax develop as the North American entry point for European cargo.

They confirmed however that the major impediment to this project going ahead was the federal government's policies on rail, diesel taxation and depreciation. These are the same problems that have been raised over and over again with this minister in the House but with no response.

Will the minister now finally respond to this issue before this proposal and the hundreds or thousands of jobs that it may create are driven south of the border to the United States?

Hon. Jean Corbeil (Minister of Transport): Madam Speaker, before this hon. gentleman talks about taxation he should know that out of $417 million in taxes collected in this country from rails, $75 million is collected by the federal government, $203 million is collected by the different provinces and $139 million is collected by municipalities.

This is a joint effort and everybody should participate. We will be glad to do so too.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Ray Funk (Prince Albert—Churchill River): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture.

As far as I know until today the disastrous Order in Council removing barley marketing from the exclusive jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board has not been proclaimed.

Since the Alberta election is today and since the vast majority of prairie farmers are still adamantly opposed to the destruction of the most effective grain marketing system in the world, I would like to ask the minister whether the politics of inclusion, which means listening to people, being advocated by his choice for Prime Minister means that he will now let this disastrous Order in Council eroding the power of the Canadian Wheat Board die the natural death it deserves?

Hon. Charles Mayer (Minister of Agriculture): Madam Speaker, I do not think what we are doing is eroding the power of the Canadian Wheat Board. All we are doing is giving producers an option to decide what they should do with their own products.

A lot of people were consulted in this process and the hon. member knows that. It has been a very open process going back almost a year and a half. The result was that a committee was struck which included people from all parts of the industry. The committee basically set its own terms of reference, hired its own consultants and came up with its report. Many groups on the prairies certainly support this.

Just to conclude, this is about giving producers a choice and letting the producers themselves decide in their own wisdom what the best way is to market the product they produce.

Mr. Ray Funk (Prince Albert—Churchill River): Madam Speaker, it appears obvious that in spite of all the song and dance about change, about renewal and about inclusion that nothing has changed across the aisle. The corporate giants are still in charge of John Diefenbaker's party.

My supplementary question is for the same minister, this time in his role as the minister for co-ops. How can he reconcile his role as an advocate for co-operative principles with his recent decisions on the future of the Canadian Wheat Board and the Crow benefit? He knows full well that these institutions are the pillars which four generations of prairie people have built up in order to maintain a degree of control over their livelihoods and their communities.

How can the minister be advocating policies which are undermining and destroying the very basic idea of organizing society co-operatively which he has sworn an oath to defend within this government?

Hon. Charles Mayer (Minister of Agriculture): Madam Speaker, I should remind the hon. member very simply that the original co-operative on the prairies goes back to the Sintaluta trial in 1904. That established the Territorial Grain Growers' Association which is now the United Grain Growers. It operates in all four provinces, including the Peace River part of British Columbia. The United Grain Growers is very supportive of this decision.

I should also remind him that many members of co-operatives of Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba pools support this.

• (1450)

The hon. member stands up and mixes up some of these things. He knows absolutely nothing about which he is talking. This is a good decision. It is made in the interests of the producers themselves. It lets producers exercise some judgment. That will result in better income for individual producers.

That is what this is about. It gives producers a chance to earn more themselves instead of continually coming to the government for hand-outs. We are in favour of that. The NDP is in favour of making everybody wards of the state. That does not work.

* * *

GIANT YELLOWKNIFE MINES

Ms. Ethel Blondin-Andrew (Western Arctic): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Labour.

For more than a year now the city of Yellowknife has been wreaked by increasing tension, violence and utter frustration and the volatile strike at the Giant mine continues. Because the federal government has full jurisdiction over this situation the people of Yellowknife are forced to wait until the minister decides he is ready to work seriously on resolving this crisis.

What additional action is the minister planning to take to alleviate the residents' agony and to avoid another deadly incident in this strike?

Hon. Pierre H. Cadieux (Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport) and Minister of State (Youth) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, as the hon. member knows the Minister of Labour is out of the House today on government business. He will be in a better position to answer the question on his return.

However, I wish to underline the fact that the Minister of Labour has been very much involved with this particular issue. It is a very difficult and complicated one. As far as I can recall he did everything that could be done at the time, bearing in mind the different legalities involved, et cetera.

I am sure the minister will respond personally to the hon. member when he returns.

Ms. Ethel Blondin-Andrew (Western Arctic): Madam Speaker, this conflict has been simmering for over one year. The minister has not even been to the city of Yellowknife in that year. People are near the breaking point. Violence is on the rise. Nine lives have been lost and the mediation process has not been as successful as we would have liked to this point.

The minister promised to resolve the conflict six months ago but today, the city of Yellowknife has one strike still unresolved and it is facing another possible strike with the other mine.

Parliament recesses tomorrow. What is this minister going to do?

Hon. Pierre H. Cadieux (Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport) and Minister of State (Youth) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, as I just said the minister will certainly get back to my hon. colleague.

Mediation did not go as well as it was supposed to, I can share that with my hon. colleague. As a former Minister of Labour I did not like it when mediation did not go as well as it should have. Mediation involves parties. The parties have to be willing to mediate. I am sure the minister will give it his full attention on his return.

* * *

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Joe Fontana (London East): Madam Speaker, the Minister of Employment and Immigration will know of this case. I brought it to his attention about 10 days ago. It concerns a London woman who was denied unemployment insurance benefits because she served almost nine months on a jury.

Betty McIntosh sat for over nine months on a jury in a murder case. When the trial was over she went back to work for eight weeks and she was laid off. Her only reason for not being employed was that she was on jury duty, yet she has been denied full unemployment insurance benefits.

Will the minister stop penalizing a Canadian for fulfilling the civic responsibility of jury duty and extend this woman's UI qualifying period to what she is entitled to?

Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Madam Speaker, I hope the hon. member can explain to the person in question that the UI act does not provide for the extension of the unemployment insurance qualifying period when a claimant has been on jury duty.

Mr. Peterson: Then fix it.

Mr. Valcourt: If the Grits are so good, why did they not introduce it when they made that provision in the act?

Madam Deputy Speaker: I was under the impression that the hon. member for London East wanted an answer. Maybe we could let the minister answer.

• (1455)

Mr. Valcourt: Madam Speaker, the fact of the matter is the current act does not provide for such an extension. I have written to the hon. member explaining the provisions of the act. I have indicated to him that in a comprehensive reform of the Unemployment Insurance Act this is something that could be looked at.

I am sure hon. members would agree that as the administration of justice is a provincial responsibility, the provinces should see to it that citizens of this country who serve as jurors because it is their obligation and duty should be fully compensated by the provincial governments.

Mr. Joe Fontana (London East): Madam Speaker, that response is unacceptable and irresponsible.

The minister knows that the Unemployment Insurance Act now provides for an extension of the qualifying period for certain circumstances where people have been prevented from being employed. An example of one of those exemptions is convicted criminals. This exemption does not apply to Canadians who have put their lives on hold to sit on a jury but it does for convicted felons.

Will the minister do the right thing today and give Betty McIntosh her due justice and grant her the unemployment benefits?

Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Madam Speaker, that is exactly why I have indicated if we are going to reform the Unemployment Insurance Act this is a provision we could look at.

Unfortunately I cannot break the law today in order to satisfy this case. The act is clear. With all the powers we have, we cannot unilaterally amend the Unemployment Insurance Act.

* * *

HIGHWAYS

Mr. J.W. Bud Bird (Fredericton—York—Sunbury): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport.

The department recently released information that indicates our national highway system is in need of at least $14 billion worth of capital investment to bring it up to standard. The weakest link is in New Brunswick.

While I appreciate the $500 million commitment which has been made to highway construction for the next five years, that amount of money indicates we will be 25 years or all of our lifetimes before we ever really fix our national highway system.

In this process of collaborative planning and budgeting by finance and transportation ministers, has that been adopted as a priority agenda? Are we making any progress on a timetable that would bring our highway system into focus in 10 years rather than 25 years or longer?

Hon. Jean Corbeil (Minister of Transport): Madam Speaker, as the hon. member knows the Minister of Finance in his December economic statement decided to invest $500 million on highway infrastructure as a temporary measure.

The transport ministers of all the provinces and the federal government have been working together for five years now to try to arrive at a proper solution. The question is how to finance this new infrastructure without infringing on the budgets of each province and the federal government.

We tried it last December. We could not come to an agreement and we are going to have another try at the next meeting of transport ministers in the early fall.

Mr. J.W. Bud Bird (Fredericton—York—Sunbury): Madam Speaker, I have a supplementary question.

Have any serious studies been made for a federal-provincial initiative that might examine highway construction as a major economic stimulater to put Canadians back to work?

Hon. Jean Corbeil (Minister of Transport): Madam Speaker, we are examining every manner in which this could be financed. However, the big item for the provinces and the federal government is how to spend additional money on this new infrastructure while at the same time not neglecting the existing highways.

* * *

THE DISABLED

Ms. Lynn Hunter (Saanich—Gulf Islands): Madam Speaker, my question is for the minister of external affairs.

Brad Magnus is a special person with Down's syndrome. He has overcome the conventional wisdom and experience that said he would be untrainable both socially and educationally. He graduated from high school in 1991 in the mainstream program and is currently studying dance in Victoria.

As the minister can see from the documents I sent to her, Brad has been invited to give the keynote performance at an international conference in Vienna this July. It is a great honour and a recognition of his extraordinary accomplishments.

Can the minister find any way to assist Brad and his family to make this trip a reality, to give support to this Canadian ambassador for the disabled?

• (1500)

Hon. Barbara McDougall (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Madam Speaker, I really appreciate the material that the hon. member sent me just today during Question Period and would agree with her from my very cursory look at it that this is a Canadian well worth honouring and assisting.

I do not know to what extent this falls within my department. I am certainly prepared to look and see if there is anything that we can do and, if we cannot, to see what else could be done to assist someone who is truly an exceptional Canadian. We will do everything we can.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Madam Speaker, earlier in Question Period today in a direct answer to the member from Winnipeg South Centre the House leader for the government implied that there was no arms deal between Canada and France signed in the last 48 hours. In fact, I have in my hand a copy of a report indicates that at the Paris air show, Aerospatiale SA said today that Canada has placed a major order for its ERYX shoulder launched anti-tank missile in the biggest weapons contract signed between France and Canada. The estimated cost of the contract is in the neighbourhood of $57 million.

I want to ask the House leader of the government why he kept that information from the House today and what he and the defence minister are trying to hide.

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): This particular project, the anti-tank weapon, was in fact started in 1987. Last summer there was the announcement of a contract to the French firm Aerospatiale to deal with the industrialization of it. It is in the defence policy of 1992. Short range anti-armour weapons and ammunition is part of the program. What I was suggesting was the hon. member's colleague stood up this afternoon in an attempt to embarrass the Minister of National Defence and suggest that something covert was done this morning, a surprise to the country. It is a surprise only to people who have not done their homework.

Mr. Horner: Mr. Speaker, I seek the unanimous consent of the House in order to table the 18th report of the Standing Committee on Justice and the Solicitor General which is Bill C-128.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

JUSTICE AND SOLICITOR GENERAL

18TH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Bob Horner (Mississauga West): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 18th report of the Standing Committee on Justice and Solicitor General.

Pursuant to the order of reference of June 3, 1993, your committee has considered Bill C-128, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Customs Tariff, child pornography and corrupting morals, and your committee has agreed to report it with amendments.

[*Editor's Note: See today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

Mr. Friesen: Mr. Speaker, I would ask for the consent of the House to revert to the tabling of petitions.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Does the hon. member for Surrey—White Rock have unanimous consent to table a petition?

An hon. member: No.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

NORTHUMBERLAND STRAIT CROSSING ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. MacKay that Bill C-110, an act respecting the Northumberland Strait Crossing, be read the third time and passed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The hon. member for Hillsborough has seven minutes left in questions and Comments.

Mr. Ron MacDonald (Dartmouth): Mr. Speaker, earlier in the debate there was a lot of comment about the level of consultation that had been undertaken with the people of Prince Edward Island prior to the Government of Prince Edward Island under the former premier, Mr. Ghiz, and the current premier, Ms. Callbeck, agreeing to proceed with this type of a proposal for a fixed link to Prince Edward Island.

• (1505)

Earlier in the House some members of the New Democratic Party seemed absolutely determined to leave the erroneous impression on the public record that there was not a minimum or an unusual level of consultation with the people of Prince Edward Island before this project went ahead. I would like to ask my colleague the member for Hillsborough, who has been a supporter of the review process all through this piece, what exactly has been the level of public consultation that has taken place in Prince Edward Island? More specifically could he give us some idea as to what the results of the plebiscite that was undertaken in 1988 were and what public opinion polls show today as the level of support by the good people of Prince Edward Island for this proposal.

Mr. Proud: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Dartmouth for raising some very pertinent questions relating to this topic.

The level of public consultation I suppose depends on who you are asking the question. If you are asking me the question I believe that there was adequate public participation in this process. I do not know where you would go from here. There were many meetings held in Prince Edward Island, but not only in Prince Edward Island. They were held in New Brunswick and in the Pictou area in Nova Scotia.

I suppose it can be argued that enough was not done and there was not enough input. I attended many of the meetings. They were all very well attended. The opponents and the proponents of this legislation on this project all had their day to speak their mind and as far as I can understand everyone was heard. I suppose we could go on for another six months or a year and hold more hearings. How much we would accomplish I do not know.

As I said this morning and the other day, if every project with any environmental consequences was studied in the manner in which this project one was studied and with the efforts put forward, I do not believe that there would be much of a problem with projects that we hear so much about in this House and across the country today. I believe that the people of Prince Edward Island have spoken. They did in 1988. It was fairly close, around 60:40 in favour of it. However there were polls taken here in February and March that indicated 65 per cent across the island were in favour.

I understand that more recent ones have been taken that show 70 per cent. It depends on what area of the island you are in. In the area where I live I am told that it is close to 80 per cent. More and more people are beginning to believe that this is going to go ahead, it has to go ahead and that we really need this project. We

need it right now to spark the economy and to get it going, but we need it in the long term to give us that stable, permanent access to the rest of Canada.

I believe that adequate study has been done, but I suppose you could argue that there is room for more. As was said here this morning, there has to be a time when you come to a decision and have made the decision that all the demands by the court be met, all the demands by the environmentalists and the fisheries people, the workers on the ferry who are going to change jobs or retire, whatever the case may be. All of these things have either been taken care of or are in the process of being taken care of. I believe that the time for the rhetoric is ended. Let us get on with the project.

Mr. Peter L. McCreath (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, all members will be pleased to know I am of limited voice today. Therefore my speech will be of limited duration.

As a maritimer I want to make a few comments about this extremely important project. The project is important not only to the people of Prince Edward Island but to the people of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia as well.

• (1510)

I wish to commend publicly the Minister of Public Works for bringing this project to fruition. I think it appropriate that it is a minister from the maritimes who has done this. This is a project that has been talked about for many years. It was first promised in the federal election of 1891 and has been promised by many political parties over the years. It is very much to the credit of the Minister of Public Works and this government that they have brought this project to fruition.

This bridge will last for a minimum of 100 years and probably more and will have a very profound impact on the economy of Atlantic Canada. Obviously it will be of great benefit to Prince Edward Island. Something like a 25 per cent increase in tourism is expected. This will benefit not only Prince Edward Island but also Nova Scotia and New Brunswick as well. Tourists visiting the region will want to visit all parts of the maritimes. I hope after their visit to P.E.I. they will all come down and see the beautiful beaches of the South Shore as well as our historic towns like Lunenburg, Liverpool and Shelburne, not to mention the new Ross Agricultural Farm.

I could go on speaking about the beauties of the South Shore, something that is very easy to do, but I think perhaps it is more appropriate that I confine my remarks to the Northumberland Strait crossing.

Clearly there will be benefit to the agriculture and fishing industries. Producers will be able to time their transportation. Transportation costs will be significantly reduced, thereby benefiting all producers.

There has been some suggestion that people in Prince Edward Island are not totally behind this project, as my hon. friend from Dartmouth pointed out only minutes ago. Rarely has there been the extent of consultation as there has been on this, even to the point of having a provincial referendum. It is interesting to note that current opinion polls indicate that support for the project has increased by over 10 per cent from the results of the referendum. Clearly the economic, social and cultural benefits of this project are being widely recognized by people of the maritimes and particularly in Prince Edward Island.

The short-term benefits are obvious as well. About 70 per cent of the expenditure of some $850 million will be spent in Atlantic Canada. This is obviously of tremendous benefit to our region. Similarly it is expected that some 3,500 person-years of employment will result. Over the next few years we are going to need all of the employment opportunities we can get in Atlantic Canada. The benefits that will accrue, particularly for the people on either side of this strait, are obviously critical.

The members from Prince Edward Island in this place, although they do not always agree with the government, I think support this endeavour and have worked hard to get it. However, nobody has worked harder, in addition to the Minister of Public Works, than my hon. colleague, the member for Cumberland—Colchester, who has been a strong advocate of this project since we arrived in 1988. The success of this project is much to his benefit as well.

Obviously there is some concern about the impact on the ferry workers of Marine Atlantic. One should take note of the fact that a suitable severance package will be negotiated and these people will have first opportunity at employment within the project.

In concluding, I want to say this is very important legislation. I know that members of the New Democratic Party have some environmental concerns. These have been addressed. This project has been very thoroughly studied in all its environmental impacts. It will be a great thing for Atlantic Canada and I urge all members to support the bill.

Mr. Ron MacDonald (Dartmouth): Mr. Speaker, it is unusual that I have to put on my ear phone to hear the member for South Shore. Today he sounds a little better on the ear phone than what he normally does. Usually I do not have to put it on when he is yelling from across the aisle.

Today we do agree with him. I think today his tone is much better. He thinks he has had a successful weekend. I see that he is eyeing some of the chairs down in the front. God knows what for.

An hon. member: The minister for the fixed link.

An hon. member: A summer job.

Mr. MacDonald (Dartmouth): He is looking for a summer job I am told. However, I would like to ask him a question in all seriousness.

The member does his very best to represent the region that we come from, Atlantic Canada, and I guess in fairness to do what he thinks is in the best interests of all Canadians. We have heard some very dangerous statements in the House during this debate about this project being a megaproject, with all of the negative connotations that that statement is supposed to bring with it by the New Democrats. We have heard them trivialize the amount of economic activity this project will bring. They say it is for a few millions of dollars to be invested in the area and a few hundred jobs.

• (1515)

I want to ask my colleague who lives just south of where I am from in Dartmouth, if he believes as I do that transportation infrastructure is the key to economic development in Atlantic Canada? Could he comment about what he believes this particular project will do for economic development not just on Prince Edward Island but also for northeastern Nova Scotia and the southeastern part of New Brunswick?

There was some talk earlier today from the member for Skeena saying that the ferries are always on time. I had indicated that the problem was not that of the ferries being on time. It was the length of time you had to wait to get on a ferry because there are so many people who want to see that beautiful island. Could he also comment about the secondary impact that this link may have on tourism on places like the south shore of Nova Scotia.

Mr. McCreath: Mr. Speaker, it is the first time that a question has actually been longer than the speech. The answer will have to be relatively short as well. I would say to the hon. member for Skeena that obviously he has never visited the maritimes in the winter-time if he thinks that the ferries run on schedule.

I want to commend the workers of CN Marine and the crews of those vessels who do an outstanding job. But the reality is that anybody who lives in the maritimes and travels back and forth from Prince Edward Island knows there are very severe problems from time to time in the winter. I hasten again to say this has nothing to do with the quality of the people working on the ferries. But there is an icing condition and it proves tremendously inconvenient from time to time to people travelling back and forth.

As my hon. friend indicates, the economic potential is tremendous for the entire region. If one thinks of fish plants on Prince Edward Island—granted we are having some difficulty at the moment getting the resource—and the agricultural industry in particular, the estimated annual savings in transportation costs to those industries is some $10 million. That is extraordinary. As the member said, frequently trucks as well as passenger vehicles find themselves waiting hours and hours, particularly in the summer-time, to get across on the ferries.

The inconvenience and the capital cost of the time lost while trucks and others are waiting to get across is great and there would be a very significant benefit there. In terms of the region as a whole, I think he may be in part alluding to tourism. Usually tourists that are visiting the maritime provinces do not only visit one place and leave. They come by car and do a loop. Perhaps they will go up the Cabot Trail, they will go over to P.E.I., to the Halifax-Dartmouth area and come down the South Shore. They will visit different areas.

The fact is that Prince Edward Island will be more accessible. Let us face it, Prince Edward Island is one of the greatest tourist attractions in Canada. The mere geography of the place is so beautiful that its impact is going to benefit our entire region creating—and this is the last point—the need for capital expenditures and infrastructure for transportation.

Earlier today we heard the hon. member for Fredericton—York—Sunbury talking about the state of the Trans-Canada Highway in New Brunswick. I am very proud that this government made an $800 million commitment to improve the highway system in Atlantic Canada. There is no question that there now seems to be no limit to the amount of money we can use for transportation infrastructure. It is a step in the right direction. This project is critically important to our region. I again urge all members to support the bill.

Mr. Pat Nowlan (Annapolis Valley—Hants): Mr. Speaker, I have a question and I thank you for recognizing me and the member for Dartmouth and the member for South Shore.

We are all members from Atlantic Canada. I would like to say to the member for South Shore that while I appreciate the softness of his voice, I would be interested in pressing him on the soundness of his intellect in terms of priorizing $1 billion in expenditure in Atlantic Canada. Is he telling this House that in effect, if he had $860 million, which is the cost of the bridge in one estimate of public works—but we all know that it is going to be $1 billion, $2 billion at the most—and that is not with overruns, that that is the way to spend money in Atlantic Canada?

Mr. McCreath: Mr. Speaker, if what we were talking about was $1 billion that could be taken out of the air, we might choose to spend it in different ways. In this case I would remind my hon. friend that the Government of Canada is already committing $42 million a year in perpetuity to subsidize the ferry service. Once this bridge is finished, there will be no further need for the subsidy. Not only will the subsidy be discontinued but in actual fact the Crown will acquire a very valuable asset. It is more in the context of an investment. The cost is predominately being borne by the private sector. The company involved will be responsible for raising the funds so that the cash requirement for the government zeros out, which is my understanding of the financing of the project.

• (1520)

I would be prepared to say to my hon. friend that clearly this would seem to be a very good investment for the taxpayer as well as a significant capital investment for Atlantic Canadians.

Ms. Lynn Hunter (Saanich—Gulf Islands): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to participate in the debate this afternoon, although I confess to having some trepidation in doing so, given that it is sometimes perceived that members from one coast should not comment on what is going on on another coast. I understand the kind of sensitivities when a member of Parliament from British Columbia comments on events occurring in Atlantic Canada.

I want to preface my remarks by saying I do not think it is just that I know better than those members from P.E.I. or New Brunswick. I just want to give my perspective. As a national policy-making body, that is our responsibility.

Having stated my respect for the sensitivities involved, because we in the New Democratic Party do not have members of Parliament from Prince Edward Island, I would ask that my Liberal colleagues also show that same respect because we have not been terribly well served by the Liberal Party in British Columbia. They have only one member from B.C. and he is very rarely in the House. I think that our frustrations are from both sides in this debate.

I also want to begin my statement by saying why I am interested in this bill. I am an islander. I was born on Vancouver Island. I am fortunate enough to continue to live on Vancouver Island. That is the big island in my constituency. I am honoured to represent six smaller gulf islands. All of those islands are served by a ferry system which is paid for in total from provincial coffers. There are no subsidies at all. It is the provincial government's responsibility to pay for the ferry service.

My constituents, because of the downturn in the economy, have had that ferry service reduced over the last few years, particularly the inter-island service, from one gulf island to another. The majority of the traffic is from the mainland of British Columbia to Vancouver Island and that is very well served with hourly ferry services. There is also a high-speed ferry and a catamaran that serves the area very well. However, inter-gulf

island traffic has been cut down and that has changed the way of life on the gulf islands, some would say for the worse.

The other area that piques my interest in this is a constituency thing and also my respect for islands generally. Islands teach you, when you live on them, the finite nature of resources. If you live on an island you have to be aware that the water is finite, what you throw out must stay there. In a larger community, in a larger land mass, we can throw out our garbage and pretend it goes away. On an island we cannot do that, so I have a very strong affection for islands.

That leads me into my second area of interest. This bill focuses the attention of the House and the attention of all those watching the whole debate on the future. We have been fooling ourselves in this country and I think internationally that growth is the way, that growth means progress. The criterion for success in the future is going to be sustainability and this bill or this concept goes against that sustainability criterion.

• (1525)

Sustainability is a merging of environmental considerations with economic considerations. Some of the Liberal members talk about this not being a megaproject. I do not know. When it gets up into billions of dollars it certainly seems like a megaproject to me. That is a lot of money.

I think the people of Prince Edward Island have been given more than enough information to make decisions on this but it is not just the quantity of information, it is the kind of information that they have been given. There has been a confusion of estimates, analyses and assessments on this issue. That is what it should be called: a confusion of documents.

My colleague from Skeena likens it to a tidal wave of whitewash and I would agree with him on that because I think the whitewash hides what is really going on here. The people of Prince Edward Island have been promised economic renewal and lots of jobs but the bill does not say anything about that. It does not give any guarantees. There are many things that should be considered.

It is this government that has introduced environmental assessment review legislation. Those of us in the New Democratic Party did not support it. The Liberals did support that legislation. That legislation has not been proclaimed yet so the environmental assessment was on the old guidelines. The guidelines were given and the panel looked at this after the plebiscite in 1987. The entrepreneurs and the Mulroney government were sufficiently serious about the proposals that it was sent to an environmental assessment panel.

The copious evidence that the panel deliberated over showed a number of things. It conceded that the fixed link might benefit trucking firms and the tourism industry and produce construction jobs throughout Atlantic Canada. I know that is what the members from Atlantic Canada are arguing for.

However this should be said clearly. The panel still concluded that the risk of harmful effects from the proposed bridge concept was unacceptable and it recommended that the project not proceed.

This is critical because I think the confusion of rhetoric surrounding this keeps obliterating the fact that an environmental panel recommended that the project not proceed. The Department of Public Works decided to proceed in violation of that recommendation.

The Friends of the Island, the group on Prince Edward Island that has an opposing view, took the government to court because of its promises to proceed. The Federal Court of Canada under, Madam Justice Barbara Reed, ruled on March 19, 1993 with respect to the proposed fixed link between P.E.I. and New Brunswick that the: "Minister of Public Works has failed to comply with requirements of section 12 of the Environmental Assessment Review Process guidelines order".

Not only are those speaking in favour of this project going against the environmental guidelines recommendation but they are going against the Federal Court of Canada. It is not just the wacky New Democrats, as some would have people believe, but it is the Federal Court of Canada and the federal environmental review process that is opposed to this project.

• (1530)

People have credibility. How can we speak in this House about standing up for the laws that are passed here if the members in this House do not respect those laws and do not respect a federal court's judgment? I think this is quite a sad story in the dying days of this Parliament when we are being put in contempt of the

Federal Court and also of the environmental assessment review process.

It really does show why some of the rhetoric, particularly from the Liberals, is so vitriolic because they have been shown up. We have not seen their environment critics up speaking on this bill. No, no, they are hiding on this one because they want to be green environment critics. They want to be standing up for the environment.

An hon. member: They did not vote for their own amendment.

Ms. Hunter: My colleague points out that they did not even vote for their own amendment.

I think this is a further demonstration of the Liberal's amazing facility for being on both sides of the fence on most issues. That may be good enough in the way of old politics but it is not good enough in today's world. People are watching. They understand that the environment critic and the members from Atlantic Canada speaking in favour of this are members of this same party and are in complicity with the government in pushing this bill through. This is in defiance of their own rhetoric on environmental assessment and in defiance of the court system in Canada.

There are a number of reasons why we have to be opposed to this. It defies logic. It gives money to big foreign corporations. It will probably put an estimated 600 ferry workers out of work.

I know there has been something said about the ferry service not being efficient and there are considerations of weather that would inhibit the ferry's ability to operate. Last year, which was not exactly a gentle winter in Atlantic Canada, there were 13,000 sailings of which only 5 were even delayed.

People should know that the ferry service is seven days a week. On five of those days there is a 24–hour service where they take dangerous goods and cargo in the small hours of the morning.

Ferry service is much more environmentally benign than a bridge or a fixed link. We know that weather considerations can close down highways and I am certain they can close down bridges when one considers the weather conditions that exist in the Northumberland Strait.

One can imagine a 120–kilometre per hour gale hitting a bridge that is 120 feet in the air. I would not want to be on that bridge. I would be sitting on *terra firma* until the storm passed. That is what happens when the ferries do not run: highways do not open under those conditions either.

The megaproject mentality has gripped and made captives of those in their favour. I understand the kinds of motivations for that coming from communities where there are a number of people who are unemployed. People are grasping at just about any ability to put people to work. I give the benefit of the doubt to the members of Parliament from Prince Edward Island. They really do probably believe that they are acting in the best interests of their constituents. I wish they would accord those of us in the New Democratic Party the same amount of respect when we disagree.

I think this really does come to the whole point as I indicated earlier that this is a debate on sustainability. If we do not get our heads around that concept I think we are all in big trouble. Not just in Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia but in British Columbia as well. We have our own problems on that front.

• (1535)

We in this esteemed House have to be the ones who show the leadership and have the courage to be able to say: "Wait a minute, is this such a good idea? Is that $42 million going to be the kind of economic engine that we want for our communities. Is bigger better? Is this really progress?"

On my account I have said no. Let us just slow down a bit. I do not want those people in Prince Edward Island to be unemployed and in economic decline. This is because I am a Canadian. I want Canada to prosper and I want it to show leadership environmentally and economically. I think that we have to get the idea of sustainability in our own heads and policies. They cannot be mutually distinct. They have to be merged.

In conclusion I think there have been a lot of vitriolic words hurled in the last couple of days on this. It goes to the very fundamentals of the kinds of difficulties that we as politicians have to make because we are in an economy in transition. That is pretty scary because none

of us has all the answers although some of us think we do.

I ask that people put aside their partisan interests and think long term here. We have a responsibility to try to do the best on behalf of all Canadians. I ask them to just reconsider their support for this project and what is going to happen to the lobster and scallop fishermen or the environment itself. Who speaks for the creatures and the earth that is going to be scored by this project?

Mr. Dave Worthy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, for a couple of west coasters I guess it is legitimate for us to enter into the debate on the fixed link to Prince Edward Island.

I have been listening to the debate for the last couple of days and in fact for the last few months. The criticism of the New Democratic Party has been pretty aggressive especially of late. It is not because of their contribution during the committee or during the debate. It is not that it is illegitimate to debate differences.

I think many people see the hypocrisy that is entailed in the debate. It was not during the legislative hearings. It was well-represented by the member from Sault Ste. Marie and the comments were very constructive. He worked with us and was helpful. Obviously he had criticisms and he occasionally had somebody else from within the party who came and also offered criticisms. However, those tended to be constructive and they tended to show the different sides. Not all the testimony received by the committee was positive.

There are many people on the island of Prince Edward Island. There are about 30 per cent who either have concerns or are opposed to the link. Obviously there are two sides to this issue and they were heard through the consultations that have taken place over the past many years. It is when the interpretations from one party are taken and they lose any relationship to the realities that were discussed during the hearings that it becomes somewhat farcical.

We are being accused of being scum bags, scoundrels and corrupt. I know that the hon. members working on this bill and the hon. members from other legislatures in Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia who also have been working with us on this bill are not corrupt scum bags who are trying to hoodwink the people of Canada.

This is a very serious piece of legislation with the best interests of the Islanders at heart. It is something that we as British Columbians can share the enthusiasm for because continued perpetual subsidies to the Islanders and Prince Edward Island or to the maritimes is not what they want in Atlantic Canada. This is an opportunity to use free enterprise to come in and—

• (1540)

An hon. member: Don't make a speech.

Mr. Worthy: I have been told that I should not make a speech. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, actually I started to get carried away.

I do have a question and it deals with the sustainability theme that the member was bringing out in her speech. I just want to emphasize that the key concern of the environmental panel was the ice delay. Subsequent to that panel Environment Canada selected a team of ice experts, including Captain Eugene Barry from the Canadian Coast Guard Base of Dartmouth, Nova Scotia; Dr. Kenneth Croasdale from Esso Resources Canada Ltd., Calgary; Dr. Robert Frederiking from the National Research Council of Canada; and Dr. Torkild Carstens from the Norwegian Hydrotechnical Laboratory in Norway. Not only did these ice experts review—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I think the hon. member should put the question.

Mr. Worthy: They have produced their report. They have appeared in front of the legislative committee. I would ask the member to comment on or criticize the competence or the credibility of these members of the panel and their report.

Ms. Hunter: Mr. Speaker, I certainly will not make any criticism of the individuals. Their abilities are undoubted.

However the member mentioned hypocrisy. I think it is hypocritical for a government to bring forth legislation on environmental assessment and then ignore it. I think it is hypocritical for a government to act in contempt of a Federal Court judgment.

We have a system of counter checks which both the government and the so-called Liberal opposition, although it seems to be a Liberal partnership with the government on this issue, seem to be ignoring. I am not saying that we know best. I know that there have been

lots of words put in different mouths in this debate. I am just asking the member to stand back and wait a minute.

The population of Prince Edward Island is slightly more than my riding. There are four members of Parliament for Prince Edward Island and one in my riding. That kind of disproportionate use of resources is something that if we are going to be fiscally responsible we have to know when we are talking about equitable uses of the tax base, and there are no federal subsidies for the ferries that operate in my riding—

Mr. Worthy: We have a constitutional requirement.

Ms. Hunter: I understand we have a constitutional requirement for ferry service. We do not have a constitutional requirement to give money to the offshore companies that are going to be profiting from this. We have a duty to employ Canadians and use the tax system as a way of doing that.

I do not believe this project achieves that, and that is quite apart from the environmental concerns I talked about in my speech. When we are talking about hypocrisy I think the member should ask himself whether or not it is hypocritical to introduce environmental legislation and then not accept its recommendations.

Mr. Howard Crosby (Halifax West): Mr. Speaker, let me begin by commenting on the last reference by the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands.

I come from a constituency, Halifax West, that virtually has a greater population than Prince Edward Island. I do not resent the province of Prince Edward Island having four members in this House and I do not think any other member of this House would resent that or call attention to it. It is part of Confederation. It is part of the give and take. That is what was lacking in the member's presentation. There is give and take in Canada. There is give and take in Confederation.

For the member to suggest that those who do not oppose this bill are lacking in courage is not only insulting but a gross misunderstanding of the situation.

• (1545)

Of course there are problems with the fixed link. Of course there are environmental difficulties that have to be overcome. Of course there are questions about the financial feasibility. All of those will be looked at and are governed by this legislation.

All this legislation does is give an opportunity to the people of Prince Edward Island and the maritime provinces to gain an economic advantage. It is not about depriving British Columbia or fracturing Confederation but about strengthening Confederation and the maritimes. One has to be from the maritimes to understand that.

Of course we take chances. We will always take chances. We cannot have all the resources of British Columbia transplanted to the maritimes. We have to make do with what we have. For the member to cast that as a lack of courage is insulting.

I want to say one thing because I took one thing from what she said. Among the concerns are the more than 600 employees who may eventually lose employment as a result of this project. Every one of us, and I know I speak for both the Liberal and Conservative members from the maritimes, are concerned with that. There is a solution to that. However that is not a reason to stop economic advantage for the maritimes. Those people can be assisted and hopefully find other employment. I know the government will look after those interests.

Do not let that be the member's excuse. Do not let the member's support of the labour unions be the excuse for voting against this bill.

Ms. Hunter: Mr. Speaker, I think this is just another further continuation of a distressing lack of respect for opposing views. In the dying days of this Parliament it is unworthy of the member to suggest that I was casting aspersions on those in Atlantic Canada.

I represent Canada as a member of Parliament, not just the people of Saanich—Gulf Islands. I think that my time on the Constitution committee shows that I understand Confederation and the give and take far better than he does.

Mr. J.W. Bud Bird (Fredericton—York—Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity in the closing hour of this debate on the Prince Edward Island fixed link to state my complete support for the concept of the crossing and for the need to pass this legislation and get on with this project as quickly as we can.

As others have said before me and we all know, in a plebiscite of the citizens of Prince Edward Island in 1988 more than 60 per cent of them voted in favour of this crossing. Since that time, as the crossing plans have developed and the process of selecting a contractor has taken its course, the project has become potentially the single most important economic undertaking in the maritime provinces. It has the highest level of backing from the broadest range of supporters.

The majority of the people agree with their federal and provincial governments. The federal and provincial governments support the project regardless of their political affiliation. Business organizations and most Atlantic Canadian unions are very vocal in their support of the project.

Earlier this afternoon I spoke in Question Period and asked the Minister of Transport if any serious and innovative studies had been undertaken with respect to highway construction as an economic stimulus. One of the values of this project, which I certainly hope will prove to be extremely valuable, will be our ability to assess whether the investment in this project, quite apart from its feasibility with respect to the replacement of ferry services, will demonstrate economic vitality and will initiate economic revitalization and resurgence of the type that so many people suggest should be the case.

• (1550)

I hope that the value of this project, quite apart from its other benefits, will be to provide us with a test case as to what extent capital investment of this nature will stimulate general economic recovery. We have been told that 40 per cent of our Trans-Canada Highway system, our national highway system, is substandard and that it will require $14 billion to bring it up to standard. That is based on a 1989 estimate and is much higher than that now. It is very tempting to wonder whether we should not be embarking on capital investment in this project and other infrastructure needs of Canada as an economic stimulus to speed the pace of the recovery which is moving ever so slowly these days.

The project has been addressed from all perspectives. I primarily want to speak to it in terms of its environmental impact and its fiscal impact. In March 1993 Madam Justice Reed of the Federal Court ruled that Public Works Canada should determine how the specific bridge design by Strait Crossing Inc. might affect the environment and to do so before any irrevocable decision to proceed had been made.

The government is not in agreement with Madam Reed's ruling and has filed its notice of appeal. It is the government's position that the environmental assessment process has been followed and that the generic approval should apply to the specific approval. Therefore an additional environment review seems to be an unnecessarily long delay. Why should a specific design which meets previously assessed and reviewed environmental performance undergo an assessment of its own?

We look at the threats of further court challenges as another attempt to tie up the project in the courts and hope that it will die a natural death.

We hope to avoid further delay and to proceed expeditiously with this very important project which is so greatly needed to boost the economy of our part of Canada. That is why I support the government's decision that in the interim, pending the court hearing of the appeal, Public Works Canada will abide by the rulings of Madam Justice Reed and give the project the best opportunity to proceed without losing the importance of this construction season.

Madam Justice Reed ordered that the Minister of Public Works make a determination of the environmental soundness of the specific SCI bridge design under section 12 of the guidelines order. In compliance with that order Strait Crossing Inc. has prepared a specific environmental evaluation of its proposal. The evaluation document has been made public and Public Works Canada has held hearings as the initiating department to conduct a public review of the information and to solicit public comments.

We look at the threat of further court challenges and can only wonder at how long people will fight to delay this project which is so strongly supported by so many people.

The province of Prince Edward Island has proceeded with plans to introduce a constitutional amendment initiative. This answers another significant question in the process.

The entire process has been conducted with great public consultation. The minister invited the public to submit their comments on his decision with respect to a public review panel. The main environmental impact of this project will be managed in a fair and equitable way. The fishermen, who may not have full access to their traditional fishing areas for certain periods of the bridge construction, will be compensated. A trust fund of $10 million has been established by the developer which will

be managed by a fisheries liaison committee headed by fishermen themselves.

Now that the Federal Court's decision has been followed by Public Works Canada I cannot imagine any project, even one of this significance, being put through any more scientific and public scrutiny. There have been 64 public meetings and more than 90 studies on all aspects of the project. I am satisfied that it has met the environmental test and is ready to proceed.

Since 1876 the federal government has fulfilled its constitutional obligation for communications between Prince Edward Island and the mainland by way of a ferry system. The first year-round ferry system was in fact started back in 1917. This federal responsibility has come with a price tag which throughout the years has varied with the evolution of services and the need for capital. Generally it is predicted to average something in the area of $40 million to $42 million annually in 1992 dollars.

• (1555)

As presented by Transport Canada to the legislative committee, $42 million is the sum of the direct operating subsidy to Marine Atlantic, the cost of the administrative overhead, the replacement of the vessels, the cost of refitting the old ferry boats, and the capital costs of the land-based facilities such as docks and transfer bridges.

This amount also takes into account ancillary expenditures such as the cost of highway improvements, the compensation to ferry workers and the administration and overhead costs incurred by Public Works Canada.

In other words this is what the taxpayer of Canada would have to come up with for the next 35 years without any relief in sight to fund this transportation link. During the House committee sessions even the NDP expert on economics admitted that this number was "fairly credible even if the ferries are going to have to be replaced".

Essentially the Northumberland Strait crossing project provides for a private consortium to finance, build and operate a bridge to replace the Borden-Tormentine ferry service. The government's obligation will be the payment of a 35-year annual subsidy to the private sector company. Bill C-110 deals precisely with the payment of that subsidy which is not to exceed $42 million per year in 1992 dollars. It should be noted that the subsidy will not be paid to the developer until a pre-agreed upon completion date comes into effect. If at that time the bridge is not completed the developer will have to pay for the ferry system.

Essentially what we propose is a transfer of public funds from a ferry system to the operation of a bridge without any overlap. Through this legislation future expenditures of the government associated with the constitutional obligations to Prince Edward Island will effectively be capped and fixed for the next 35 years.

Therefore it stands to reason that the financial approach to this project is both fair and realistic as it will entail minimum costs to the Canadian taxpayer.

I want to speak briefly about the economic impact of this crossing on the economy of the Atlantic provinces. One major requirement for the project is that the developer must first maximize the use of Atlantic Canada suppliers of goods and services. As a result 70 per cent of the $850 million required for this project will be spent in Atlantic Canada.

The crossing project will provide approximately 3,500 person years of employment and several hundred million dollars of industrial purchases within Atlantic Canada over the next five years. Indeed, this project will contribute greatly to the over-all government objective of reactivating the economy.

It is with that in mind plus the fact that this crossing is wanted by the citizens of Prince Edward Island and the citizens on the New Brunswick side as well that this project will assist the economy of Prince Edward Island in a variety of ways. This project has received environmental study and environmental approval of the widest possible nature. This project is a fiscal investment that will replace costs already being spent by the Government of Canada. It will entail no new money and in the end 35 years from now we will have an asset linking Prince Edward Island to the mainland of New Brunswick that will have been delivered virtually free from investments which we ordinarily would have had to make in any event.

I believe that in these very difficult days of a slowly recovering economy from a very serious recession that the immediacy of this project and its application over the next five years will have untold benefits to the revitalization of the economy of Atlantic Canada and by implication to Canada itself.

Mr. Steve Butland (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, this is the third or fourth time I have had an opportunity to speak to this bill. I do not want to upset my friends from the maritimes, in particular P.E.I.

• (1600)

I agree with my friend from Saanich—Gulf Islands that indeed the debate did get quite vitriolic. Generally, very reasonable people have said what I think are some very unreasonable things. After my original speech and some of the amendments, I am not very amused with comments concerning rhetoric coming from the NDP. The citizens of P.E.I. and the rest of Atlantic Canada are not very happy with the criticism that has been levelled. In no way did we want to criticize the people of Atlantic Canada or Prince Edward Island. We still maintain that 30 per cent of the people in P.E.I. are likely opposed to this link.

If we were in the shoes of the members from P.E.I., we would be saying the same thing. This is job creation at its greatest. It would be a real test. I was thinking of an appropriate analogy. If somebody said that they were going to build a skydome as they have in Toronto in Sault Ste. Marie, would you support it? If somebody is going to build it for you I would probably be jumping up and down and saying, absolutely. Whether or not it is best to spend private developers' money and taxpayers' money is another thing. The hon. member for Halifax sort of intimated where there is unemployment, we should build bridges.

People talk about the municipal infrastructure program. We are talking about sewers that are collapsing across this country and built bridges that are collapsing. We are dumping raw sewage into the waterways of the country. To equate this to the national infrastucture program I do not think is really acceptable.

They are continually saying: "You people do not have a member elected in Atlantic Canada, in P.E.I. nor do you ever hope to have one". Well, we hope to have one. To say that we do not have a right to comment or to question the project is inappropriate.

You do not have to be a native to appreciate native issues. You do not have to be a Jewish person to understand anti-Semitism. You do not have to be black to understand discrimination. To understand and appreciate some of the pitfalls of a fixed link, I humbly suggest you do not have to live in Atlantic Canada. I want to put that in perspective. I appreciate that perhaps this is not terribly substantial but I want to say that we put forward amendments that we thought were substantial and some that I thought were quite reasonable and might be acceptable to the government side. They were not.

This legislation that has been brought forward, as my friend for Annapolis Valley—Hants suggested to me when I was looking for the rights words, is nothing more than to enable the private developer to bring forth the deal with all of its details. It is nothing more than an enabling piece of legislation. It is wide open. It is very open-ended. To submit some of those concerns before the Canadian people is not wrong. This is a megaproject. I have not yet decided if I am against megaprojects or not. To deny the fact that it is not a megaproject is ill-founded.

I want to talk for a minute about bridges, the length of bridges and the hazards. I am told that this is a nine-mile long bridge. I live fairly close to a bridge. We have an international bridge from Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario to Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan. It is a very short span. Fifty miles away is the Mackinaw Bridge, one of the world's finest bridges. It is five miles long. There is no guarantee that you can cross that bridge in bad weather. The wind can be so severe that they close the bridge. To say you can get back and forth every time is not the truth. This proposed link is longer and I suspect the ice flow is much greater.

To proffer some of these concerns is surely not inappropriate. I would ask that members at least give us that.

• (1605)

If the people of P.E.I. were given funds for community or job development, I wonder if this would be their first choice, their second choice or their tenth choice. I am not convinced about that.

I always go back to the very beginnings of this. Who brought it forward? It was a developer who said: "How about if we build a bridge for you? What would you think of that?" I know there is a whole chronology and history of events. I do not know it all that well but I do know there was an expression of interest, not by the people but

by the developer. It is not the appropriate title but it is sort of a turnkey approach. "We will build you this thing and in 35 years we will turn it over to you".

An hon. member: Have you visited P.E.I.?

Mr. Butland: No, I have not visited P.E.I. but I promise you folks I will get there. I will still catch the ferry. I have some affinity to ferries because as a youngster—this is an anecdote—before the bridge was built in Sault Ste. Marie there were ferries back and forth. I earned my keep as a summer student on those ferries. Maybe that is why I have a personal affection for the ferry route rather than the bridge route. I promise the members I will go to P.E.I. If the ferries are still operating—I understand they will have to—I will take the ferry.

I have not read but I have been inspired perhaps to get *Anne of Green Gables* and *Anne of Avonlea* and read some of the text. People have accused us of going back to the future. The NDP is always back to the future. A lot of Canadians are looking back to the future and saying what a wonderful time it was. What are they going to say 50 years from now? Maybe we want to go back to the future in 1994 when we had car ferries and *Anne of Green Gables* as we knew her. I am going to end with a 30 second comment.

I quote Lucy Maud Montgomery who made this comment in 1911:

> When I am asked if Anne herself is a real person I always answer no with an odd reluctance and an uncomfortable feeling of not telling the truth for she is and always has been from the moment I first thought of her so real to me that I feel I am doing violence to something when I deny her an existence anywhere save in dreamland.

That is from the author of *Anne of Green Gables*. It is a bit of nostalgia but I wonder if 50 years from now we will regret the decision that obviously is coming forward from the government side and the opposition side.

Mr. Pat Nowlan (Annapolis Valley—Hants): Mr. Speaker, I too am glad to speak at third reading stage in the closing few minutes of this debate. I speak with mixed thought as I have spoken before.

I commend and compliment the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie who spoke before me. While we do not share the same party label this is beyond party labels as far as I am concerned.

I speak as you well know, Mr. Speaker, as an Atlantic Canadian. I am certainly very sensitive and respect the views of all members who have spoken, especially those from Atlantic Canada, and have declared right from the start without all the figures, reports, assessments and environmental problems, the fishery beds or the ferry workers. I come clean with a philosophical bias against any type of link between the mainland and the island. I feel very fundamentally that this is going to change the sociological character of the island. Lucy Montgomery who wrote *Anne of Green Gables* and other nostalgic novella will really be able to say from her resting place that *Anne of Green Gables* is going to become *The Ghost of Cavendish Beach* if a fixed link joins the mainland with the island.

• (1610)

I am from Nova Scotia. I have been on the island. I respect my colleagues from the island. Obviously if I was a member from the island with a built-in work project that supposedly was to be done entirely by private enterprise I would be only too happy for the potential jobs.

I have been here a few years and I look at the chunnel from England to Europe which was supposed to be all private enterprise, and the taxpayer is very involved. I am prepared to put my seat on the line to any member in this House and I wish they would too that the Canadian taxpayer is going to be involved in the fixed link in one form or the other after this bill is passed.

The figures themselves defy logic. The original estimate many years ago was $860 million and it will end up being a $1 billion bridge anyway.

The mother of one member of this House was in this House when a lot of energy and $14.9 million was expended on the foundations for the causeway in the 1960s which was finally abandoned in 1969. We can still see the rock work, the foundation and the track for the causeway that was going to cross the strait. That was interesting at the time as it came just before an election. It was sort of election fodder. I am afraid with all the respect and sincerity of all colleagues who have spoken,

that the timing of an election and the bill on the fixed link coming so close together is another interesting coincidence.

I am an Atlantic Canadian as are the members from York—Sunbury, Egmont, Hillsborough and others who have spoken. I would love to believe the statements of the Minister of Public Works as he introduced the third reading debate on the bill this afternoon. If I believed him I would not be speaking now.

I have had the experience of that 1960 construction and/or many of the conflicting reports. Frankly as far as I am concerned the fact of subsidies is a sham. Members have said we are going to take the subsidy money and put it in the bridge. There is nothing in this bill that says that subsidies will not continue to be paid to ferries. In the riding of the Minister of Public Works the government is going to commission a brand new ferry for some $48 million from Pictou Industries in Pictou County to ply the strait.

We are not going to have a bill on a fixed link, and that ferry will be built to last as long as the life of the so-called fixed link. We are not going to have a brand new ferry coming down the old draw way on a commission exercise in three or four months and put it in mothballs because we have a fixed link. There is too much hocus-pocus in this bill.

Although the public should mind, I do not mind the opposition speakers—and I discount the members from P.E.I., I can understand their point of view—and the government members all getting into bed together. This time thank God the members of the NDP are not in bed with them too as they were on the Constitution.

I was one of the lonely voices on the Charlottetown accord, speaking of the island. There were a few of us who took objection to it in this House and voted against it, yet all the parties for their reasons were for it. The people spoke on October 26 on the Charlottetown accord. I will not go back to the real history on Meech Lake. There was one Liberal who eventually became president of the Liberal Party, the member from Mount Royal, Donald Johnston on the Liberal side and I on the opposition side who had the temerity to speak out on Meech Lake. My point is not to relive the Constitution. This Parliament has no credibility on the Constitution in view of what has happened and frankly it does not have any credibility on a project like this so late in the day.

• (1615)

How can we go out to the Canadian people and say there is fiscal restraint and we have to cut back here and there, and my goodness gracious there is a Santa Claus somewhere who is going to build the fixed link that has been talked about before Confederation?

I come from Atlantic Canada. Why do we not build the Chignecto canal? We have talked about it and from a Moncton point of view we could build it. Why not build the old dam from the Fundy tides? There are many beautiful projects out there.

In conclusion, the fact is we really destroy our credibility when out of the blue we seem to have some benefactor and a new program that is supposedly not going to cost the taxpayers any money. While every member has had things chopped from stem to stern we pretend we are going to fool the Canadian people and build a fixed link to P.E.I. that does not cost the taxpayers a penny.

Mr. Speaker, just by saying that proposition proves the point. You know it, I know it and the Canadian people know it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Before I recognize the hon. member for Moncton I have a point of order from the hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Charles A. Langlois (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and to the Minister of National Defence): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think you will find unanimous consent for the following two motions:

> That Private Members' Business hour today be cancelled and the item dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence and that the House continue to sit for the consideration of government orders.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Members have heard the terms of the motion. Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Langlois: I also move:

That, with regard to Bill C-128, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Customs Tariff (child pornography and corrupting morals) and notwithstanding any Standing Order; immediately following the disposal of Bill C-110,

1. Bill C-128 shall be deemed to have been concurred in at the report stage and ordered for consideration at the third reading stage immediately;

2. The House shall not adjourn this day until the third reading stage of the said bill has been disposed of.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Members have heard the terms of the motion. Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed the following bill: Bill S-20, an act to change the name of the Canadian Medical Association, to which the concurrence of this House is desired.

Pursuant to Standing Order 135(2), the bill is deemed to have been read the first time and ordered for second reading at the next sitting of the House.

* * *

NORTHUMBERLAND STRAIT CROSSING ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. MacKay that Bill C-110, an act respecting the Northumberland Strait Crossing, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. George S. Rideout (Moncton): Mr. Speaker, I have waited all day for this. It is a pleasure to be part of the concluding speakers on this debate. We have heard a lot of discussion, a lot of very interesting comments and a lot of theories about things. Maybe in the moments I have available to me we can deal with some of the facts.

There is a constitutional requirement to connect Prince Edward Island to the rest of Canada. It is only the methodology that is at issue. What we are talking about is whether we want to maintain the ferry service or build the bridge.

What everybody forgets in that whole process is that if we say we are going to keep the ferry service going then we are going to continue to pay a subsidy for that ferry service of $42 million a year in today's dollars and we are going to spend $500 million or more on new ferries over the next 35 years. So we are talking equivalent dollars with respect to the subsidy every year and the capital costs range anywhere from $800 million to $850 million for the bridge, or $500 million to $600 million for the ferries. We are talking about comparable expenses.

• (1620)

We are not talking about comparable convenience for the people who want to get to the island to see *Anne of Green Gables*; visit all the tourist attractions that exist on the Island or leave for very short periods of time before returning to the island. They will not have to face the inconvenience of staying in line for three or four hours waiting for the ferry to take them across. They will be able to go across on the bridge and do what they wish to do on the Island.

I have read some of the books talking about island history. I have read all the rest of the plays and *Anne of Green Gables* but they never mention the ferry. They talk about the island, what is there and what is being offered. That is not going to be altered by the bridge. It is a bridge to the island. It is fulfilling the constitutional linkage which all have agreed to. It is just trying to take the transportation network up to modern standards.

I have listened to some of the talk indicating we have not fulfilled the environmental concerns. We have heard about the judgment that says everything is wrong. It goes on and on and on. But again let us look at the facts. The court said there had to be a generic environmental study. While it may have solved all the problems it was necessary to take the specific bridge, have it analysed to a degree and get public input. That process was done. The list of public hearings over the last number of days and weeks extends to a great length. The hearings were done.

The judge said the government had to take a look at the different constitutional requirements as well as sections 12 and 13 of the legislation which deal with the environment. Section 12 requires that every initiating department shall screen or access each proposal for which it has the decision-making authority to determine if the potentially adverse environmental effects that may be caused by the proposal are insignificant or mitigable, and that has been done.

The minister, under the legislation which the NDP says prohibits this project, specifically provides a methodology to have the project approved and that was done. The approval has been given. Environmentally the government has met the test.

I can remember the debate we had when it was going to committee. We wanted to satisfy ourselves about three things: (1) Environmentally does it stand the test? (2) Will the fishermen be looked after during the construction? (3) Will the workers who worked for Marine Atlantic be looked after? (4) From my vantage point, I want a commitment that the government would ensure that Marine Atlantic headquarters would stay in Moncton. All four concerns have been met.

There are conditions in the agreement to preserve Marine Atlantic in Moncton. The environmental assessment on the generic bridge has been done. Section 12 assessments have been done. The public hearings have been done. There is a pot of money to look after the fishermen while the construction is ongoing. There is a pot of money to look after the workers who are displaced by this project. Everything has been done. But any time we want to pursue a project that will have some benefit to Atlantic Canada, somebody from the west coast or somewhere else says we should not go ahead with it.

Mr. MacDonald (Dartmouth): They are usually New Democrats.

Mr. Rideout: The member for Dartmouth reminds me they are usually New Democrats. Exactly.

Mr. McGuire: Hibernia.

Mr. Rideout: Hibernia is another example. When they hear about these projects that are going to be beneficial to Atlantic Canada they say if Prince Edward Island gets a bridge they want one in their riding too. They should get their constitutional facts correct.

We want to see a project that is going to benefit Prince Edward Island, establish a modern transportation link with Prince Edward Island and benefit the Islanders as well as other Atlantic Canadians who will be working on this particular project. The benefits will flow to the island. I think it is about time we did a project in Atlantic Canada rather than have all the negative talk all the time. I say this in all candour. I am not trying to throw any large stones at my friends in the NDP because some of them have been very reasonable on this project, but some have not. I think they do a disservice to the environmental movement because they should not use the environment to block every project. There are projects that can be done and environmentally sound projects can be done.

• (1625)

Very simply put, all that we are looking at here is a bridge. We have been building bridges for thousands of years. There is nothing unique about this particular project. We have had scientists tell us about the ice in the straits. We have had environmentalists tell us about all of the impacts that are going to take place. From an environmental standard, the bridge is probably the safest method of construction.

I should confess that when I first looked at this project I thought the tunnel would be the thing to do. I thought environmentally that would be the best way to proceed. There were two opposing reasons. One was that environmentally it was not the best way to proceed, contrary to popular opinion. The other was that the cost would escalate to almost twice the amount because a tunnel requires that everything be done doubly.

The simple fact of the matter is that we have to get over this idea of a megaproject. Granted it is a megaproject in dollars, but it is nothing unique. It is a bridge. We build them all the time. The people in Hull would like to have a couple more so they could get over to Ottawa more quickly every morning rather than being tied up in traffic. We have to get over the ideas that it is something unique or a megaproject.

All we are doing is equating the cost of a ferry service to the cost of a bridge and doing something that is going to benefit people. Let us get on with it. Atlantic Canadians have been hearing this story for a long time. It is time to get to work rather than to talk.

Mr. Joe McGuire (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, on February 8 of this year—I remember it was February 8 because it was my wife's birthday and I forgot all about it—I led off the second reading debate for my party on Bill C-110. This bill will enable the government to sign a contract

with a private company to build a fixed link to Prince Edward Island.

Today, June 15, I will be the concluding speaker on third reading for the same bill. I am very happy with the way the whole debate has turned out. For a while I did not think this bill would ever come into the House of Commons. We had second reading on February 8 and today, in the last days of this Parliament, this bill is back in the House of Commons for its final reading.

I would like to compliment the people in my party from Newfoundland and Labrador, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, I should say from all the Atlantic provinces and from Ontario, both francophone and anglophone, who represent various ridings across this great country of ours.

Those members took a lot of time not only to come to the House and speak on behalf of this project between Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick, but also to do a lot of research. It was evident from the content that their speeches were not taken lightly. They did much research and worked hard to put together their remarks to represent their constituents' feelings toward this particular project between Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick. I thank them all for that.

I would also like to compliment the member for Sault Ste. Marie who has led the debate for the New Democratic Party. His remarks have been exemplary not only here in the House but also in committee. He has been fair. He is doing what he is charged to do as an opposition member.

His party obviously took the position that this bill was not a good bill. However, that does not detract from his ability and his right to stand up in this House and criticize this particular bill or to try to improve it in committee and at third reading. That is what his party has attempted to do. I know some members of his party went a little overboard in their remarks and there was reaction to that which happens quite often in this House. This is not a gentle debating society most days.

The hon. member has said that he has never been to Prince Edward Island. I would like to invite him down to P.E.I. to show him our beautiful province.

• (1630)

He also represents a riding with a fixed link between the two Sault Ste. Maries. He said that when he was a young man he used to ride the ferries back and forth. Maybe that is why he feels so strongly about Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick losing their ferry system.

I would like to ask a question. Where are the ferries today? Why are they not there? The answer is obvious. It was an inadequate transportation system between his part of Ontario and the United States for the free movement of goods and services and people across the border. That is why the ferries are not there. It no longer made any sense to keep them running.

That is the same position we are in today. It no longer makes economic sense. As England has found out, today it no longer makes any sense to be apart from the rest of the world or even the rest of the country. We have links and bridges between Canada and the United States yet some people think it is wrong that we should have a link between the provinces in our own country.

I would ask the member to think about that and to come down before too long and pay us a visit. We will have some good lobsters. We might go for a ferry ride and jig some cod, if there is any left down there.

I also commend the Minister of Public Works who has done a lot of work on this particular project. Over the years he has been a good representative for the maritimes. Prince Edward Islanders relied on him quite a bit because we do not have a member on the government side, especially during the time of the closure of CFB. Over the years we relied on the hon. member for Central Nova to go to bat for us. He has been good for Prince Edward Island. He has been good for his own province and good for the maritimes.

A week ago last Monday he had to visit Prince Edward Island to unjam or break a deadlock between some of our civil servants and bureaucrats who basically were asking the province to pay a very high price in order for the government to continue with this link.

It was a visit from the minister, taking his prerogative as an elected member, as a cabinet minister and as a decision maker in this country. It shows that politicians and ministers can still make decisions. He visited our province and within a short number of hours we had the

agreement between Canada and P.E.I. about the constitutional amendment which the province of Prince Edward Island will be passing today.

I assure all members that the constitutional amendment will be passed because we have 31 Liberal members in that legislature. Even the Leader of the Opposition is in favour of this bridge, so I do not think that the judge who may be ruling today need worry that the constitutional amendment is not going to pass.

Let us go back to why members on this side and members of the government are supporting this bridge. We live in a democracy and the people have spoken not once but three times on this particular project. First there was a referendum. Many members mentioned today how the referendum was won on the yes side and how support for the link was increasing in P.E.I. if we go by the polls which effectively are snapshots.

Also, we had a provincial election in 1989, after the referendum was taken. The government, the party that was supporting the fixed link in Prince Edward Island, was returned with 30 seats out of 32. There was another election this year. The provincial party that was supporting the fixed link and supporting this particular project was returned with a majority of 31 to 1.

• (1635)

If we are listening to the people at all, in neither of these elections was this a particularly big issue. If it was a big issue or concern we would have heard about it during the campaigns and there would have been a major fight against it. That did not materialize at all.

It is my view and I think the view of the majority of the members in this House that the people of Prince Edward Island have overwhelmingly supported this particular initiative on three occasions. What we are doing today really follows the dictates of the majority of the people of Prince Edward Island.

I would like to compliment the member for Cariboo—Chilcotin who was the government leader at the committee stage of this bill. He made sure all parties co-operated as far as witnesses were concerned at committee stage.

Whether they were for or against the link, anyone who wanted to come to the committee was allowed to. Whether they were the Friends of the Island or the Island for a Better Tomorrow, whether it was the fishermen's association, the fishermen's union in New Brunswick, the ferry workers' union, whether they were representatives of business or labour in P.E.I., all were welcome. Even people who were looking for a free ferry service were allowed to come in, say their piece and submit their position to questions. Some of them did not. Some of them used up all their time with presentations but that was their choice. They were allowed to come in and all parties were heard in the Parliament of Canada at committee stage.

I would like to compliment the hon. member for his open-mindedness and his co-operation in that particular part of this legislation.

I do not think there is anything new to say about this bill. We have gone through all the necessary debate on this. After the vote today it will go to the Senate. I encourage the senators to expedite this legislation so work can begin this summer. This is not a guarantee the project is going to go. It is just another step, but a most important one. We still have a way to go after today before the contract is signed and the project begins.

I make the prediction that what will be happening in Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick is not just a fulfilment of a constitutional commitment made 120 years ago, but this project will become a wonder of the modern world. People will come from all over the world to view this particular project. As the member for Labrador says, the concept will be used many times in the future on major projects. The financing part of it is a unique contribution to a project which will be built in a unique way.

Mr. Steve Butland (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, just when you think everything has been said I thought of one more thing. However, the member for Egmont will still get the last word which is only appropriate.

I have a very brief comment. I think it was John Donne who said that no man is an island. I have to make that politically correct and say that no person is an island. However, it has just dawned on me: When is no island an island? When a bridge is built, it is no longer an island.

The member equated the international bridge between Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario and Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan to this particular link. He knows that is totally erroneous. My neighbouring colleague from Algoma asked how the member for Sault Ste. Marie could be against this link when he wants a little link in his own constituency rebuilt. It is a lock. It is a $12 million to $13 million project. He asked how it was possible to vote against this link and at the same time look for funds from the government to repair that lock. Both analogies are absolutely erroneous and I know the member will agree with me when he stands.

Various polls have been taken. We probably have to accept the fact that the plebiscite or whatever it was called several years ago was 65-35. I understand that another poll has been taken and it is still predominantly in favour. I wonder whether the members from P.E.I. have asked the young people because they have most at stake in this.

• (1640)

I just came across a letter written by Ilana Kunclius, president of Students for Environmental Action in Bluefield High School. She is talking about the analysis being rushed. "We feel that for Public Works Canada to continue this megaproject without the suggested and crucial environmental studies is irresponsible". This comes from a young person and I am just wondering in all sincerity, what is the feeling of the young people of P.E.I. about this project?

Mr. McGuire: Mr. Speaker, I do not think anybody has asked the young people directly how they feel about the project but many of the parents of these young people have certainly been asked.

I have a letter addressed to many people on Parliament Hill from the P.E.I. Council of Labour. I would think they are the parents of many of the young people of P.E.I. There are 2,000 letters in my office which I am going to give to the minister. They are business people and supporters but who are also parents of the children of P.E.I.

I would like to quote from a letter: "The Prince Edward Island Council of the Canadian Federation of Labour was the first provincial organization to officially endorse this project through convention resolution back in 1986". That was two years before anything concrete happened. "Since that time we have reconfirmed our position at each subsequent convention. Today we are closer to the reality of this project proceeding than ever before. However there are still a few hurdles". That was in reference to the court case.

Major labour organizations, the major business community in Prince Edward Island and ordinary citizens have flooded us with letters for the past month and a half, ever since the court case came down. They urge not just opposition members but government members to hold firm, to continue to work closely to address the concerns of Madam Justice Reed. That has been done. Yet no matter what happens, we address all the legalities of it and the environmental concerns and what does the NDP come up with? Have we asked the kids in P.E.I. how they feel.

The time has come to stop asking who is for or against it and to proceed with the building of this project.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Moncton—Christine Lamont and David Spencer; the hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands—The Environment; the hon. member for Bonavista—Trinity—Conception—National Defence; the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Immigration; the hon. member for Prince Albert—Churchill River—Indian Affairs.

An hon. member: A short question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Questions and comments have terminated. There was only five minutes remaining. It is the clock I have in front of me that counts.

It being 4.45 o'clock p.m., pursuant to an order made Monday, June 14, 1993 in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 78(3) it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the third reading stage of the bill now before the House.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those who opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion, the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Call in the members.

• (1705)

And the bells having rung:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order, please. There is a problem with one of the green buses. A couple of doors are jammed or something and a few members are not able to come in. We will wait two minutes.

Mr. Andre: Mr. Speaker, a point of order. It has come to our attention that one of the prominent members of this House will not be with us tomorrow by virtue of activities in his home province. This member has served here with great distinction for some 25 years and I speak of the hon. Speaker himself.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): You don't want the Speaker to have tears in his eyes.

Mr. Andre: I want to say congratulations, Mr. Speaker, for everybody here, since you preceded most of us anyway, as one of the illustrious members of the class of June 25, 1968. I think there are six of you still in the House. You have successfully run in seven federal elections, served with distinction and diligence on behalf of your constituents, on behalf of this House, on behalf of the government, as a minister in the Clark government. On behalf of your friends and colleagues, all of us here in the House and the many millions of Canadians who know you and love you, all the best to wherever former linemen go.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Foster: Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join with the House leader in paying tribute to you on your 25th anniversary of serving in the House of Commons.

You were among some 96 members who were elected in 1968, of which there are only six left. I believe at the end of this Parliament there will only be two. We want to congratulate you on your 25 years in the House of Commons. As the House leader said, you are a former Edmonton Eskimo and when you became the deputy opposition whip in 1972 to 1976 you led some mighty challenges and attacks on the government front benches benches during that time.

I recall as well that you led some great sing-songs at Speaker Jerome's summer home in the Gatineau on a few occasions.

You served as the Minister of State for Fitness and Amateur Sport and Multiculturalism in the Clark government in 1979 and in 1984 you were chosen Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole House. You have been able to bring all your skills of diplomacy to bear on this place.

I want to congratulate you. You are a really great family man. You have five children and three grandchildren. One was born I believe March 30. I recall we were paying tribute to you at that time or to your new grandchild. I had the honour of mentioning Kathleen's name in the House. It is probably the first time that a child has been born and introduced to the House of Commons the following day. That is something that I remember about your family.

• (1710)

I want to say that in your biography, it mentions that you are a great singer. Those of us who have had occasions to be with you on more festive occasions know that is true.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Foster: You might even put the Minister of National Health and Welfare to shame if you were to do your rendition of *Hello Dolly* right now. One of your other favourite songs is *Sunny Side of the Street*.

That is one of the great tributes that can be paid to you, Mr. Speaker. Whenever you enter a room to join in, you bring joy, happiness and exuberance to the occasion. That is what will be remembered most.

We are glad that you have been here for 25 years. You have brought joy, exuberance and good feelings to this place and specially in your position as Speaker. We wish you well. We wish Betty well and we wish your entire family well.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues, my leader, my wife and myself I wish to echo the remarks made by my two colleagues about you.

There was only one time in all the years I have known you or known of you that I was very mad at you and that was when you helped to beat the Saskatchewan Rough Riders.

An hon. member: Shame.

An hon. member: Shame on you, Steve.

Mr. Benjamin: I have never forgiven you for that.

Mr. Speaker, the only thing that I have always noticed about you, and so have all of us, is that you never try to pretend to be more than what you are. You are always Steve to all of us. For countless thousands in this country and specially in Edmonton, Alberta generally you are always one of us and one of them. It speaks well of you.

I want to say to you as a fellow survivor of the class of '68, as are our colleagues from Yorkton—Melville and Algoma, that there are only six of us left out of 96. It tells you something about the survival rate around here.

You and I realized a long time ago that as soon as you win two elections, you are an expert. If you win three or four you are lucky. If you win seven elections, as we have, then it is because the people decided that was the best way to keep us out of town and off welfare.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Benjamin: I look forward to seeing you, Sir, on future occasions, goodness knows when and where.

An hon. member: In the welfare line.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Benjamin: I suppose we could all line up together.

It has been a pleasure to be your friend and your colleague. We have had many happy times together. That is one thing about this place, certainly with most of us if not all of us. You exemplified that. Whatever we did or said, we never did or said it personally and we never took it personally. That has been a primary class act by our Parliaments and we learned it from the British and others. But you have carried that out all the time. I have never known you to personally object to someone.

You were an asset to us and to this place. We wish you and your family well in the future. Connie sends her best regards to you. I will see you again and we can do some more reminiscing. Good luck, Steve. We will miss you.

• (1715)

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I know you want to get to the vote so we will get to it shortly, but I wish first to thank my colleagues from the class of '78—

Some hon. members: '68.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Sorry, '68. That is how touching it is. —the hon. member for Regina—Lumsden, the hon. member for Yorkton—Melville, the hon. member for Algoma, Charlie from Davenport and my colleague the Deputy Prime Minister from Vegreville. It has been a wonderful 25 years because we have had such great members as we have here today.

I say, with all my heart, that you have just been wonderful from 1984 to—what is it 1993?

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): From 1984 to 1993 I have enjoyed the chair duty. You have been very kind to me. You have really not misbehaved. You have done everything I have said to do and that is how we got along.

Thank you again ever so much.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 539)

YEAS

Members

Allmand	Anderson
Andre	Attewell
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Baker
Beatty	Bellemare
Belsher	Berger
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Bird	Bjornson
Blackburn (Jonquière)	Blais
Blenkarn	Bosley
Brightwell	Browes
Cadieux	Champagne (Champlain)
Clancy	Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Clifford	Cole
Collins	Cooper

Corbeil
Côté
Crawford
Darling
Desjardins
Domm
Duplessis
Fee
Ferguson
Flis
Fontana
Friesen
Gagliano
Gray (Windsor West)
Guilbault
Harb
Hawkes
Hockin
Hopkins
Hudon
Jacques
Johnson
Jordan
Kempling
Langlois
Layton
Lewis
MacAulay
MacKay
Maheu
Marin
Masse
Mazankowski
McDermid
McGuire
Mifflin
Mitges
Moore
Oberle
Peterson
Porter
Redway
Reimer
Rideout
Rompkey
Schneider
Simmons
Soetens
Stevenson
Tétreault
Thompson
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt
Van De Walle
Vien
Weiner
White
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Winegard
Young (Acadie—Bathurst)—146

Corbett
Couture
Crosbie (St. John's West)
de Cotret
Dionne
Dorin
Edwards
Feltham
Ferland
Fontaine
Foster
Gaffney
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Greene
Halliday
Harvard
Hicks
Holtmann
Horning
Hughes
James
Joncas
Jourdenais
Landry
Larrivée
Lee
Lopez
MacDonald (Dartmouth)
MacLellan
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
Mayer
McCreath
McDougall (St. Paul's)
McLean
Milliken
Monteith
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Pickard
Proud
Reid
Ricard
Robitaille
Roy-Arcelin
Shields
Sobeski
Speller
Tardif
Thacker
Thorkelson
Tremblay (Lotbinière)
Vanclief
Vankoughnet
Wappel
Wenman
Wilbee
Worthy

NAYS

Members

Angus
Blaikie
Fulton
Grey (Beaver River)
Hunter
McCurdy
Nowlan
Plamondon
Stupich—17

Benjamin
Butland
Funk
Heap
Leblanc (Longueuil)
McLaughlin
Nystrom
Samson

PAIRED MEMBERS

nil/aucun

Bill read the third time and passed.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Bruce Halliday (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I seek leave of the House to move the following motion to receive a late petition for a private bill for which I think there is unanimous consent. It reads:

That notwithstanding Standing Orders 131(5), 132 and 140 the petition for a private bill from the Canadian Medical Association presented earlier this day be deemed to have been filed within the required time limit and received by this House.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Halliday: Mr. Speaker, I move:

That notwithstanding any Standing Order and the usual practices of the House, Bill S-20, an act to change the name of the Canadian Medical Association, be now called for second reading and that the House proceed to dispose of the said bill at all stages.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

CANADIAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. Bruce Halliday (Oxford) moved that Bill S-20, an act to change the name of the Canadian Medical Association, be read the second time and, by unanimous consent, be referred to Committee of the Whole.

• (1725)

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and by unanimous consent considered in committee, concurred in, read the third time and passed.

* * *

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-128, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Customs Tariff (child pornography and corrupting morals), as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and the Solicitor General.

Hon. Barbara McDougall (for the Minister of Justice) moved that the bill be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Mrs. McDougall (for the Minister of Justice) moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

Mr. John Reimer (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to begin the debate at third reading on Bill C-128 in support of the action that is being taken to amend the Criminal Code with respect to child pornography.

I should also add I had a private member's bill that would have been debated at this time. Because the subject matter of my private member's bill was also pornography we decided to merge the two and go on with Bill C-128 since one-third of the topic of my private member's bill on pornography deals with the question of child pornography and that is being served in this Bill C-128. I am going to address some of the aspects of what my bill would have done and also the bill that is before us, Bill C-128.

• (1730)

In the case of my bill I was pleased that it was designated a votable bill. It met the criteria and would have proceeded had the parliamentary calendar had enough time for a second hour of debate following today and finally to a vote. If it was successful it would have proceeded to committee and so on. Unfortunately the parliamentary calendar is coming to a close now and that will not take place. I am going to simply address what was in my bill and also this bill.

I am glad that one aspect of my objective in bringing forward my private member's bill dealing with pornography is being addressed in Bill C-128. I brought forward my bill last December and I had two objectives.

My first objective was to see if I could get the government to agree to act on the issue of pornography and simply take over the subject matter of my bill as its own, acknowledge where it came from and proceed on that basis.

The second objective, failing the first, would be that if the government did not want to proceed with my bill that it would at least introduce a bill of its own on the subject of pornography. That has partly been answered through Bill C-128.

I want to also acknowledge that many caucus members supported my bill. My bill was seconded by 14 caucus members as recorded in *Hansard*. I would like to acknowledge that the member for Niagara Falls was always a strong supporter of action that this government had to take with respect to the question of pornography. He and I were first elected in 1984. When we received the Fraser report in 1985, we were two members among many who urged the minister at that time to act on the question of pornography. It resulted in two bills which I will mention in a moment. Finally it is coming to fruition in this Bill C-128. The member for Niagara Falls as Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice shepherded that bill through committee to this stage and hopefully adoption by the House later today.

I would also like to recognize the work of the member for Mississauga West who is the chairman of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs who worked hard at ensuring that this bill and the subject matter of this bill dealing with child pornography would successfully come through to this stage today at third reading.

I would also like to say that the family caucus of the Conservative Party strongly urged the Minister of Justice to take over my bill and to come forward with a bill dealing with pornography. At least one measure of that is being acted on today. I have received hundreds of letters and phone calls and I continue to receive them in support of the bill I brought forward dealing with the subject of pornography. I lobbied the minister to take over my bill and fortunately at least one part is now being acted on.

The minister's bill with regard to the topic of child pornography is essentially the same as mine. With the amendments that were added at committee stage to the minister's bill, it really is identical to the bill I introduced on the subject matter of child pornography. I am really pleased that we have made tremendous progress and that today we are going to pass that before this House adjourns and we move toward the election which we expect in the fall.

My bill had three parts. The first part was to introduce legislation to criminalize the use of children in the production of pornography. That is what Bill C-128 addresses. In the second part of my bill, for the first time because child pornography is not in the Criminal Code now, we are doing something that is breaking ground in that area. My bill, again for the first time, would

introduce tough new measures to protect women, to criminalize violence in pornography against women.

• (1735)

Some people have suggested to me that the action we are taking in Bill C-128 with regard to children in pornography attacks the vilest and cruelest form of pornography as it victimizes children. There is a large measure of truth to that and I support that.

However I think we would all find that the action against women in pornography or the victimization of women and the way in which they are treated as things and objects and not as human beings is also repugnant and repulsive. It also leads to the same tragic results sometimes that child pornography does. That is the victimization and the brutal murdering of women which is what happens to children which Bill C-128 addresses. I find both repulsive.

That is why in my bill I had as one part the addition to the Criminal Code of actions against child pornography and as a second part actions against violence against women in pornography and in the sexual context. I think both actions deserve a very strong criminal sanction against them because both are equally repugnant to all in society who want our Criminal Code to reflect our values as it should.

I also had in my bill as a third item, and again for the first time, the introduction into the Criminal Code of a precise definition of pornography. That would have assisted the police, the courts and all Canadians to identify and control what common sense tells us is pornography.

That would have meant that rather than relying on the present term "obscene" in the Criminal Code which lacks any clear definition and also rather than relying on the phrase "undue exploitation of sex" we would have a clear guideline in the Criminal Code as to what was meant by pornography.

My bill also added any matter visual or otherwise that incites, promotes, encourages or advocates the use of children. That means that anyone who is or appears to be under 18, whether in a real or simulated situation in a sexual context or portrays any violence against a child or a male or a female or portrays any degrading sexual acts as defined in my bill against a child or a male or a female person would then be liable to criminal sanctions as outlined in the bill. I am glad the latter part with respect to children has been added as an amendment to the government bill and is a part of the report we have received here today at third reading.

Let me just mention a little history here with regard to government actions on the questions of pornography. Parliament in the early 1980s established two special committees. One committee was chaired by Dr. Robin Badgley and it made recommendations dealing with the problems of child sexual abuse and published its report in August 1984.

A second committee, also formed in the early 1980s, was chaired by Paul Fraser. It investigated pornography and child prostitution. That report was made public in April 1985. Therefore as the new government that had been elected in the fall of 1984 took office these two reports came very early in its mandate and the government then studied the results of these two reports.

Briefs were submitted to these committees clearly demonstrating that most Canadians wanted government control of violent pornography to protect both children and women. In response, the Fraser committee made 58 recommendations dealing with pornography, 9 of them concerning child pornography. The committee also recommended a complete revision and rewriting of the obscenity laws in the Criminal Code.

We have to remember that the word "pornography" does not appear in any current law in our Criminal Code today dealing with offensive materials and performances.

Many people attending the Fraser committee hearings argued that the current terminology of "obscene" should be replaced with a clear definition because of its lack of precision. The government responded and took account of the multiplicity of views expressed in those two reports and in the consultative process which it developed around the subject matter of pornography. The government then acted promptly and introduced Bill C-114, which unfortunately died on the Order Paper in 1986. Subsequently it introduced Bill C-54, which also died on the Order Paper in 1987.

• (1740)

The protection of vulnerable groups from harm, such as women and children, is an important consideration in determining the appropriate level of any intervention of the Criminal Code. Strong measures are needed to ensure that those people who may be harmed by the

effects of pornography are protected by provisions in the Criminal Code.

In the first two bills that I mentioned and also in the bill that I brought forward, I sought legal advice to make sure that the bill I presented for private members' debate, and which part of it has now been taken over, would strike an appropriate balance between the necessity to protect people from harm and also the right to freedom of expression which is guaranteed in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

The bill I presented and also this bill, Bill C-128, recognizes the need for educational, scientific and medical defences with limitations to ensure the protection of freedom of expression. We have done that to that degree, and we have tried to meet the legitimate objective of protecting children and women from violence in pornography, and in Bill C-128 protect children from violence and abuse in pornography and the need for freedom of expression.

Justice Sopinka in the Butler decision of 1992 was very helpful in his decision explaining how we would deal with the question of pornography in the absence of anything further from the House to clarify what the Criminal Code said on pornography. He explained what would constitute either an obscene matter which the Criminal Code speaks to or the undue exploitation of sex and what would be meant by that.

He did it in three categories and I quote: "The first would be the portrayal of sex coupled with violence which will almost always constitute the undue exploitation of sex". Then Justice Sopinka went on to say: "Explicit sex which is degrading or dehumanizing may be undue if the risk of harm is substantial". That would be the second test. Then Justice Sopinka spoke of the third test and said: "Finally, explicit sex that is not violent and neither degrading nor dehumanizing is generally tolerated in our society and will not qualify as undue exploitation of sex unless it employs children in its production".

He was saying to us that if it involves children then it is always obscene and always an undue exploitation of sex. That is what Bill C-128 recognizes. That is why I am pleased we are finally taking action at least on that aspect of the question of pornography.

There are some who propagate the myth that pornography is a harmless adult pleasure. I want to say a few things about that. I found a quote in *The Washington Post*. Admittedly it is an American quote but I thought it was a very good one. The writer was Nicholas Von Hoffman, a columnist with *The Washington Post*. He said the following: "Why is it liberals believe role models in third grade readers are of decisive influence on behaviour when it concerns racism or male chauvinist piggery, yet laugh at the assertion that pornography may also teach rape? Every text book in every public school system in the nation has been overhauled in the last 20 years"—and that is also true in Canada—"because it was thought that the blond, blue-eyed suburban children once depicted therein taught little people a socially dangerous ethnocentrism".

He continues: "If textbooks, those vapid and insipid instruments of such slight influence can have such a sweeping effect, what are we to surmise about the effects on the impressionably young of an X or R-rated movie in wide screen technicolour with Dolby sound and every device of cinematic realism?"

• (1745)

Common sense tells us that if textbooks that used to have stories about John and Mary, who were the blond, blue-eyed people who used to be in the text when some of us went to school, which dates us somewhat, now have to be rewritten to include people of various ethnic groups and different names, if that is so vital, then surely all these movies, videos, magazines and everything that are available to our children today do equal if not more harm to people. Common sense would tell us that. Those who want to say that pornography is a harmless pleasure simply do not make sense.

I talked to Mr. Bob Matthews of Project P, which stands for pornography, from the Ontario Provincial Police. He heads that group. He was very supportive of my bill and he pled with me to make sure that this government at least acts on child pornography, if nothing else. He also liked my bill but he said to at least make sure of that. Fortunately today we are coming to the stage of passing that.

There are statistics from Canadian and American studies. A study was done zby Dr. W. L. Marshall of Queen's University in Kingston, Ontario. He studied the inmates of the Kingston penitentiary and discovered that more than one-third of the 89 child molesters and rapists

who are in the Kingston penitentiary had committed the offence after being exposed to pornography.

In the evidence he presented to the family caucus of the Conservative Party he said that of 51 child molesters, 34 consumed pornography on an ongoing basis before they committed their crimes. He also said that of 51 child molesters, 19 used pornography as a stimulus and a catalyst to acting out their crimes. The evidence is there and it is very clear.

Another telling piece of evidence is an interview with a convicted child and woman molester. He had murdered 18 children and 10 women, all in a sexual context. His name was Ted Bundy. He was executed for those crimes in the state of Florida. There was an interview between him and Dr. James Dobson.

Dr. Dobson was a member of the attorney general's commission on pornography in 1985 during the Reagan administration in the United States. That commission was unanimous on the direct relationship between pornography and violence toward women and children.

In Ted Bundy's interview with Dr. Dobson he discussed his background. Ted Bundy told Dr. Dobson that he grew up, and he used these words, in a wonderful home with dedicated and loving parents, five brothers and sisters. He attended church every Sunday. He then said that as a 12-year old or 13-year old he had his first exposure to pornography. The pornography he looked at was in what I would characterize as adult magazines. These were soft core pornography magazines that his grandfather had hidden in the greenhouse in the backyard. Ted Bundy found these and they were his first exposure to pornography.

As a result of going through these magazines over and over, he then wanted magazines with violence in a sexual context in them. He then sought out more and more magazines depicting sexual violence. Then he would fantasize about what he had seen in the visual form and what he was reading.

He then said that at age 18:

> It moulded and shaped my behaviour—fantasized and crystallized my thoughts—all fueled by pornography—for two years I read more and more and ever increasingly violent pornography—it became an addiction—then the barriers that I knew were wrong, (that I had learned as a child) couldn't be controlled any more—I began to act out my fantasies.

He then killed 18 children and 10 women.

• (1750)

He then admitted:

> Pornography was central to the action of my murders.

He also said that pornography can reach out and snatch any child out of any home in America or North America today. He explained:

> Without a doubt every murderer that I talked with in Florida State Prison—

—and there were 81 serial murderers in that prison when he was there—

> —was consumed by pornography.

Those are some of the facts that we know and that we study. It is not a harmless adult pleasure. It is one that affects people and unfortunately it leads some to act out the very things they see and read.

In the Florida State Prison 36 of the serial murderers listed hard core violent pornography as the most prominent reason for committing the murder they committed. They said the door that opened all of them to hard core violent pornography was soft or softer pornography.

I am delighted that today we are at least moving on one-third of what my bill was trying to do, which is to act on child pornography. I wish we were also acting on violent pornography against women because I find it equally repugnant and just as vile and degrading as actions against children. I wish we were doing that too.

I also wish we were providing a clear definition in our Criminal Code of what is dehumanizing and degrading pornography, which my bill sought to do. That is going to have to wait for another Parliament. I hope the good people of Kitchener will re-elect me. If they do then I will commit myself to adding those two additional parts later. At least we are acting on the first one today.

In conclusion let me simply say the following. In one of the studies about pornography and its influence that I looked at I found a remarkable statement by several who have studied this in the United States and Canada. They were all in agreement.

They documented four steps in what happens to people who are consumed by pornography. The first step is that it is addictive to its habitual user. The user wants more and more. The second step is one of escalation in consumption and the need for more explicit and more brutal levels of stimulation. That in turn leads to a third step, which is a desensitization process that effectively makes commonplace what was once shocking, repulsive and abhorrent. Unfortunately sometimes that progression leads to the fourth step which is the acting out of the pornographic depictions, often with violent and brutal results that lead to the death of children and women.

Let me conclude by simply saying that it is time that all members of this House and all Canadians commit themselves to attack the personal and social evils of pornography. As a personal evil pornography corrupts the morals and destroys healthy attitudes toward life for the user. As a social evil it brings immense harm, even death, to innocent women and children and their families.

Bill C-128 at least starts the first step in that process. As I said before, if re-elected I will commit myself to working toward adding the other two. I commend Bill C-128 to the House for speedy passage today so that we can at least take that first important step.

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, I would like to follow up on what the hon. member for Kitchener said. I want to congratulate him on bringing forward his private members' bill on pornography. There are a lot of thoughtful provisions in it. I want to thank him for his kindness in blending together his thoughts with respect to his own private members' bill and for speaking so forcefully and so well on behalf of Bill C-128 at third reading. I listened very closely to what he said.

• (1755)

I think all members of the House are in support of Bill C-128. It would not be an understatement to say that this is an extremely important bill. I think if there is one thing I would modify in what the hon. member for Kitchener has said it is that the child pornography is not more serious than pornography involving adults of any gender. When we are talking about children we are talking about the most vulnerable people in our society.

We are also talking about members of our society who are helpless, members of our society who have had inflicted upon them the horrors of child pornography. They never really forget the experience and have to live with this degrading and horrible experience for the rest of their lives. In many cases they have their lives twisted and deformed mentally as a result of their experiences so that they are never able to fulfil their potential and lead the full lives that we would want them to have. As well, in many cases those who were sexually abused become abusers when they are adults.

Just to deal for a minute with the whole question of pornography as the hon. member for Kitchener has done, I do not think this House or anybody in this country truly realizes how the malignancy of pornography has spread through our social fibre.

In the early 1970s pornography was a $5 million industry in North America. Today it is a $10 billion industry. Of the 10 most profitable magazines on the market six are what we would call men's entertainment magazines. *Playboy* and *Penthouse* outsell *Time* and *Maclean's* in this country. Thirty per cent of all news-stand sales now consist of pornographic magazines.

We cannot have that much pornography in this country without having child abuse. The fact that is often overlooked by those who fear that government is going too far in censoring certain materials is that this material has a profound effect on the lives and futures of children in our country. Each depiction of a child in a sexual act or an unnatural position of nudity means that child was abused to facilitate the photograph or the video in question. The very fact that has happened is evidence of child abuse.

Child pornography is one of the most dangerous of all types of pornography for two reasons. First, paedophiles often use it as a tool to seduce other children and lower their inhibitions. They say to these children that all kids do this. That is okay so they should not be afraid because it is perfectly natural.

If a paedophile is operating in a certain neighbourhood there may be pressure on a child when he or she recognizes one of his or her peers in a picture. These are children. We are not talking about the mature minds of adults, and in many cases we wonder how mature the minds of adults are. The fact of the matter is that children are vulnerable. They are in a maturing state and we cannot expect them to understand that when they see these photographs that all children are not doing this. If

these children do not have guidance from other sources, adults on whom they can depend and rely to speak to about this, they are going to be influenced by paedophiles who pursue this action.

• (1800)

The second reason that it is so deadly serious to our society is the child is damaged for life in the production of a pornographic video or a photo. It is a permanent record of a child involved in either sexual poses or sexual acts. The child has the scars for life. Even when they are adults they know these images may be used to seduce other children. The fact that they have been molested and used in this way is something they will never be able to get out of their minds.

This bill bans the possession of child pornography and that is very important. Presently it is not illegal to possess this material. It is only illegal to sell or distribute it. It means that someone who produces child pornography for his own use escapes criminal liability, and I am glad to see that this is going to change.

The importation of child pornography will also be prohibited by this bill. This means the police can track the delivery of child pornography and arrest and charge the recipient. This is important because a search warrant can be issued and police may find the recipient in possession of additional pornographic material. It may also lead to information on the identity of other paedophiles as very often these people trade material and information.

The present situation under the Customs Tariff Act is that if pornography is imported, then that material is destroyed. The person who imported it is not charged. It is just destroyed and that is the end of the matter.

Now a paedophile who is attempting to build up a collection of pornographic material will simply make other attempts to obtain the material they are seeking. What are the chances of coming across this material again? It is very unlikely. There are just over 300 and some cases a year where the customs officers find pornographic material in the mail. They cannot open every envelope. It is found through spot searches. If the person orders more, the likelihood is that the material is going to get to the person who orders it.

We do not know what other situations exist at the point where this material is to be sent. By following it through to the recipient, we can find out a good deal and in some cases actually find children who are being molested and used for child pornographic purposes.

Perhaps we will even find, as I have said, the name and address of the person or company that is actually sending this material. It could be the beginning of an investigation into possession of other child pornography that may have been kept at the residence or may even be a secret location.

It is very important we realize that what we are doing here is not just saying we want to do something about child pornography. As a Parliament we have to be in a position to pass a bill that is effective. We cannot just continually talk about it.

• (1805)

In 1984 the Badgley commission stated that we had to do something about child pornography, that we had to make possession of child pornography against the law. In 1985, a year later, the Fraser Institute stated the same thing: we had to do something about child pornography and we had to make sure that possession of child pornography was against the law.

Rix Rogers, a well-known authority on the abuse of children and a special consultant to the Minister of National Health and Welfare, in 1990 came out with his report that said the same thing.

We have been talking about this for 10 years. How many children have been abused, have had their futures twisted and their lives practically ruined by the experiences that have resulted from child pornography? We can only imagine how many there have been.

If we want to get rid of child pornography, if we want to do something about sexual abuse of children, we have to do something about the children being abused now. As I have said, children who are abused more likely than not become abusers themselves. It is a never-ending cycle that we have to stop. The only way to stop it is with action through the law; to state what it is we want to do,

to make a commitment that in this country we are not going to tolerate child pornography.

We in the Liberal Party are very supportive of this legislation. I want to thank my colleague from Scarborough for his help. He will be the next speaker for our party. He made a tremendous contribution, as members of this House know.

We felt that this bill should have come long before now. It was too long in coming. But it is here now and we want to make sure it is successful. We want to make sure it passes. It has moved quickly, but because it has moved quickly does not mean that it has been frivolously dealt with. It has been considered very seriously. We have had witnesses, we have listened and we have taken into consideration the concerns that people might bring forward and have brought forward.

We have also said that we are not in any sense interfering with freedom of speech. Certainly not. We do not feel this bill in any way interferes with freedom of speech. However we have to take a stand. We have to say something. We have to make a commitment and we have to do something that is going to be effective.

In a recent government poll it was determined that 94 per cent of Canadians wanted to do something to prohibit child pornography. This is not saying that child pornography is being produced everywhere in Canada. It is not being produced in Canada very much at all, but it is being imported and it is being imported very easily.

While we have had the reports, we have not had the action. I want to mention also a very significant case, which is the Butler case that was started through the Court Challenges Program. In this case the court unanimously upheld the constitutionality of the obscenity provisions of the Criminal Code. Although the prohibition against pornography contravened the freedom of expression guaranteed in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, it could be justified under section 1 of the charter as a reasonable limit prescribed by law. This is very important because we had then our highest court in the land coming down on the side of our obscenity provisions. That was the first very important pronouncement by this case.

• (1810)

Mr. Justice Sopinka, writing on behalf of the court, said that while a direct link between obscenity and harm to society may be difficult if not impossible to establish, there was nevertheless sufficient evidence that depictions of degrading and dehumanizing sex do harm society and in particular adversely affect attitudes toward women. That was the second very important pronouncement because we finally had a case in this country that linked the dehumanizing and degrading treatment of women to obscenity and ultimately pornography. There is a second very important link.

Under the court's analysis they depicted sex with violence or degrading or dehumanizing sex as something that will almost always constitute an undue exploitation of sex contrary to the obscenity provisions of the code. This is the relationship between the actions of dehumanizing and degrading sex with obscenity and the contravention of the code. Explicit sex that is neither violent or dehumanizing will be tolerated the court said although two of the judges felt that not only the content but also the representation of the depiction would be objectionable.

However I want to underline that this is really relevant. In this context Mr. Justice Sopinka said: "Finally, explicit sex that is not violent and neither degrading nor dehumanizing is generally tolerated in our society and will not qualify as an undue exploitation of sex unless it employs children in its production".

In this act we talk about explicit sexual activity in relation to child pornography and the dehumanizing or degrading treatment of children and the words "explicit sex". There is this context. We have the invitation from the Supreme Court of Canada to do something about child pornography.

I do not want to go on too long because there are a lot of members of this House who wish to speak on this. I want to say that there has been great co–operation among all parties and I want to thank the government for this. This bill was introduced late and I had a very grave concern that we would not be reaching this point. We are just getting it in under the wire.

Our party has said from the very beginning that we did not want the House adjourned until this bill is passed. Now it seems that this may be the last piece of legislation that is passed by this Parliament. This is very important for the people of Canada. It is very important for our police forces who work diligently on this question. It is very important for the child interest groups in this country who are working day after day and are dealing with the broken psyches of children who have had to

endure this kind of treatment largely because the laws were not sufficient in our country.

I would like to close by saying that this bill is good and it must be passed by this House. I and members of my party support it completely.

• (1815)

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I would like to add on behalf of my New Democratic colleagues our support for the passage of this bill. It looks to me as if we will be able to pass it in all its stages today. There has been a previous and prior agreement to do so.

I would just like to make a few brief remarks by way of commenting on the origin of this legislation and some of the issues that I think attend it.

First I would like to pay tribute to the member for Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing. It seems that in every caucus there has been someone working on an individual basis on this particular issue. My colleague in the Liberal Party and my colleague in the Conservative Party have cited the people in their particular caucuses who have given a lot of attention to this effort.

Certainly the hon. member for Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing through the introduction of his private member's bill, Bill C-396, was also one who contributed very much to the political momentum that I think brought the House to the point where I think it is today, on the verge of passing this legislation dealing with the issue of child pornography.

I might say that in spite of the satisfaction that we take in the fact that this legislation is now to be passed and something is now to be done about child pornography, we would be remiss if we did not remark on the fact that we are in the closing days of a Parliament and in the ninth year of the political reign of the Conservative Party opposite.

Maybe sometime for the record—I say this in all honesty—we can have an explanation of why it has taken so long. Some of the members opposite made a political career out of campaigning against pornography when they were in opposition. Now nine years later and in the dying days of their government and perhaps their political reign *per se* we get this bill.

It is really a shame that we have had to deal with it as quickly as we have had to. It is the kind of thing that probably did deserve more attention but we were left in the position of saying better late than never and better this bill than some imaginary bill that might come out of a longer process. We have accepted the reality that has been set before us and we are glad to be able to work in co-operation with others to bring forward a bill that deals with child pornography.

I do think that at some point the country is owed an explanation as to why it took so horribly long for this to happen. I know some of the reasons. I know that at one point there was a bill which tried to deal with pornography in general and child pornography all wrapped up in one and that became too difficult an issue for the government and for that matter for a lot of other people.

Instead of separating them as it was requested to do at the time it decided, if my memory serves me correctly, to scrap the whole project. It took this long again to come around to dealing with child pornography only, which is exactly what it was requested to do on a previous occasion when it could not find a way to deal with the whole issue.

I think the member who spoke on behalf of the government made a point that is well taken. There is an inconsistency when it comes to certain issues but I would submit that the inconsistency lies on both sides of the House or on both sides of the political spectrum.

Sometimes people who are conservatives are loath to see the importance of role models in literature, education and for that matter religious symbolism while they very clearly see the common sense notion that pornography affects people's views and what they see and experience affects their judgment about the world.

The member made the point that liberals often are very concerned about role models in textbooks but are prepared to argue—some of them and not all of them—that pornography does not do anybody any damage. There is an intellectual inconsistency here but I will just say in fairness that I think one will find it on both sides of the political spectrum.

• (1820)

There was a time not so long ago when I was seeking the nomination in 1977–78 that to be against pornography was seen to be an almost exclusively conservative pursuit. I think people came to see, particularly as those in the women's movement began to see that pornography was an issue for them, that there came to be a broader coalition of people who were concerned about pornography and particularly its effect on women and of course on children as this legislation seeks to deal with.

However we still have another stage to go as far as I am concerned and I hope I will have the time to get to that. I just wanted to say that I am glad to see that that coalition developed. I think we see it here today in the variety of people who are speaking to this particular bill and in the variety of parties that are all speaking in support of this particular bill.

Obviously child pornography is something that has to be dealt with. I cannot think of anything more despicable really than the exploitation of children for violent or sexual purposes both in the sense of the children who are used to create these photos and so on and in the sense of the children who may subsequently be victimized in a truly physical sense by people who are moved to do that by consuming that particular child pornography. The member who spoke before me spoke very well about all the connections that have been established through research and experience into that particular phenomenon.

I am not worried, but maybe somebody is, about curtailing free speech. I do not think that freedom of expression is an absolute and I never have. There is the old thing that we discuss in first year philosophy which is whether people have the freedom to yell fire in a crowded theatre. They do not have the freedom to yell fire in a crowded theatre because their freedom to speak whatever they want is limited by a sense of responsibility for the well-being of others. In that case it is in the theatre.

The freedom of expression of child pornographers, if there is such a thing, is limited and is now to be limited by law and limited severely I hope by the responsibility that we all have to the well-being of children, both those who are directly or indirectly exploited by pornography, and the well-being of society in general.

The notwithstanding clause and the preamble of the charter of rights both indicate that the rights which are enshrined in the charter are not absolute. I think that if anybody wants to make an absolute defence of freedom of speech in this case as a way of criticizing this bill or other bills that might try to deal with pornography are barking up the wrong tree.

I want to go back to what I said earlier and I am sorry the member who spoke for the government is not here. I think we have another dimension to go. First of all we have not dealt with adult pornography and that is a remaining task.

However, let us say that we were able to come to an appropriate distinction between pornography and erotica. This is what held up a previous package because people could not come to that kind of distinction. We still will not have dealt with the all-pervasive soft pornography as it were that is blasted into our TV and family rooms day after day, hour after hour, around the clock and is now to come to us through the death star which is the satellite that will bombard us with literally hundreds of channels.

• (1825)

It is very difficult these days for parents to protect their children if there is a TV in the house and a channel changer. It is difficult to regulate what they are being exposed to unless a parent is there all the time.

I am not only talking about programming, I am also talking about advertising in particular. What is offensive about pornography in the abstract or conceptual sense is its dehumanization of the human body and human relationships, particularly as they pertain to women. Women are made into sexual objects, objects of violence or whatever the case may be.

I think our children pick up the message about women as sexual objects very soon without ever having to see any so-called pornography. They just have to watch advertisement after advertisement where women and sex are used in subliminal and explicit ways to sell everything from toothpaste to mouthwash to cars and jeans. Situation comedies and other programs are full of sexual innuendo and double *entendre*. There is variety of other ways in which young people are exposed to a far too heavy diet of having to think about sex and themselves in

a way that ought not to be forced on them at such an early age.

Perhaps this reveals a small c conservative in this socialist but I think this is a growing concern. I would like my friends over there who are great defenders of the market, deregulation and letting the world be run by consumer, corporate and market interests to explain to me how in the final analysis we will deal with this kind of pornography. The advertisers and corporate image makers are given a free hand now. They will be given an even freer hand through the proliferation of telecommunications technology and the elevation of the market ethic to a mega ethic through the free trade agreement and things like that. They elevate the marketplace conceptively to a place where it has never been before in Canadian society because we have always held the market ethic in tension with other ethics and with other ways of seeing the world.

There is a contradiction between small l liberals who worry about role models in text books and yet defend pornography. I do not think it is a contradiction I have because I do not think I am a small liberal. I am not sure who the member was quoting when he was reading from *The Washington Post*. It sounded like Robert Hughes who wrote the book, *Culture of Complaint: The Fraying of America* which incidentally is a great tirade against political correctness, if you are interested, on both the left and the right.

This is the deeper contradiction in the political mind–set of my friends on the small c conservative side. How are they going to deal with the effect of the marketplace and the implicit use of sex and sexual images to sell products? We in our society hold up those who are able to sell things as the people we most admire. The people who are able to sell millions of things well rise to the top in our society. So often this is done through the exploitation of the very thing we want to contain in another form when we find it and that is pornography.

• (1830)

When we find it in the form of promotion of a product, we say: "Well, isn't that clever. They developed that ad and got a bigger market share. They did so well. The price of their shares went up or the value of their dividends went up or whatever the case may be".

I leave that comment with you. We are anxious to see the bill passed and we hope it will have the effect so many members here genuinely hope for and that is to see child pornography drastically reduced if not eliminated in Canada.

Mr. Rob Nicholson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister of State (Agriculture)): Mr. Speaker, I remember nine years ago this month I was running for election for the first time and speaking to a meeting of Conservatives in the town of Niagara–on–the–Lake, which is part of my riding. I told them one of the things I hoped to see and be a part of in my term of office in Ottawa was new and tougher laws in the area of pornography, if I was fortunate enough to be elected. I am delighted today that after nine years, the Canadian House of Commons is set to pass new, tough laws in the area of child pornography.

I am tempted not to rise to the bait of some of the partisan comments from my friend in the New Democratic Party. He asked a legitimate question I suppose when he said: "Why did it take nine years to get a bill through the House of Commons?" I can say to him that it certainly was not because of lack of trying on the part of the member for Kitchener, my political party or me.

In 1985 we made our first attempt to introduce legislation. It was comprehensive legislation dealing with all aspects of pornography. I liked the bill and was enthusiastic about it. I was delighted when we tabled it in the House of Commons.

It was tabled in an honest response to reports that had been mentioned in this House and to individuals and groups that petitioned us to bring in a pornography bill. That bill was roundly criticized by many individuals and groups. Some very prominent Canadians did everything possible with reference to that first pornography bill. It was one of the first pieces of legislation in the justice area in which I was involved. I somewhat naively thought that maybe we did not get it quite right. Perhaps if we listened to the criticism of the first pornography bill, we would get it right. We would change it and tighten up the definitions.

I remembered looking at it and listening to all the criticism that part of the definition was open-ended. I thought it would be better in law to close the definition and make what we were talking about clearer.

I say I was somewhat naive because the next Minister of Justice, the present Governor General of Canada, introduced a second pornography bill and I was somewhat surprised that the same cast who criticized the first pornography bill lined up against the second bill. At this time I was under much fewer illusions about this whole subject and how difficult it was. I decided to see if there was anything I could do as a member of the standing committee of justice to try to meet the library boards, respond to the criticism and write letters to the editor to defend the second attempt by this government. I can say that there was quite a bit of criticism. As the member from the Liberal Party who spoke first on this pointed out, this is a billion dollar business. There are people who are prepared to spend millions of dollars to make sure that there is no new pornography bill in Canada.

• (1835)

I remember shortly after being elected a decision of the Supreme Court of Canada striking down the importation of pornography sections in the Customs Act. I will tell you what fascinated me about that. Who would go to all the trouble and expense to go to the Supreme Court of Canada to challenge a law that was blocking hard core pornography getting into this country? Of course it is the people who benefit and make huge profits from pornography. They are the ones who are prepared to challenge through every court in this land to try and strike down any attempt by parliamentarians.

There is a very well organized and financed lobby in this country that will challenge any definition of pornography. On one count they have us because it is very difficult. Very often you will hear people say: "I am against pornography but you did not get the right definition". As a member of the standing committee of justice and the last four years as Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice, I have often said: "if you agree we have a problem tell us what you think the definition should be." Of course you do not really get it then. In fact I remember one witness said to me: "No, no, my job is to see what you have come up with and then I will let you know whether that meets our standards and our tests".

The second pornography bill did not make it. I realize that the individuals and some of the groups who legitimately wanted something done in the area of pornography were very quiet, a little too quiet for my tastes. When this bill came about and people came to my office to suggest this, I indicated to them that I believed we could and should attempt a third bill in the area of pornography. I asked them not to demand perfection because none of us are capable of perfection particularly when it comes to something as difficult as this. I asked them to have a look at what we do and perhaps on this one give us the benefit of the doubt. I am of the opinion that if we cannot get a bill in the area of child pornography I am not sure we can get any bill in this particular area.

I appreciate those individuals who did speak up on this occasion. I appreciate those who have some understanding of the parliamentary process who when they came before the committee or wrote to us said: "Of course we want more". There is no advocacy group that is ever going to look at any piece of legislation and indicate that it is perfect. Nobody is going to say that because they are in the business of saying that it is well done but that we should do more. I appreciate the fact that they came out and said that this may not be perfect but for Heaven's sake pass it in the dying days of the 34th Parliament. As it has been pointed out, for the first time the possession of child pornography is a crime in this country, as it should be.

I would like to thank the Minister of Justice for being bold to take this step. He is the third activist Minister of Justice in this Parliament, one of whom will be sworn in another week as Prime Minister of Canada. It has been my honour to serve under all three of them as their parliamentary secretary. I appreciate the fact they have brought forward so many pieces of legislation and that this Minister of Justice tabled this child pornography bill because it is a good bill. I appreciate as well the work of the officials of the Department of Justice. The more justice legislation that I have been involved with, the more I have grown to appreciate the work that they do in drafting this legislation and helping to get this legislation before Parliament. I also thank the members of the committee.

• (1840)

I am not telling any secrets that anybody else in this Parliament does not already know. If this bill was filibustered it could not get through this Parliament and would die on the Order Paper.

I say to the member from the NDP that if he wants to know why sometimes these bills do not get through we are all part of a process that can delay it. That is why I think it is a very healthy experience and a very productive part of the process in which we are involved here and that committees, particularly committees in the justice area, have worked so well.

For my part, as an assistant to the Minister of Justice I have never tried to have a closed mind when it comes to the whole question of amendments. I am pleased with this bill. Last week we had the stalking bill and other pieces of legislation. It is my firm belief that if there are good ideas that come from members on all sides of the House, they should be looked at very carefully and if they can be implemented and do improve the legislation we should do it.

I pay tribute to my colleague, the member for Red Deer. If participating in legislative committees in the area of justice could get you a law degree he would have had his law degree by now. He has been very helpful. I extend that comment to the other members of this legislative committee in particular whose comments are now part of this bill.

We made a couple of very important changes today. One of them is in response to comments made by members of the opposition, comments made by members of the government and comments made by some of the witnesses.

In particular I commend the work of Citizens Against Child Exploitation. Their executive director, Monica Rainey I think made a very good point to the committee. She said that in the definition of child pornography as it existed in this bill what would be caught is pornography that showed children under the age of 18 engaged in explicit sexual activity. She and others pointed out there are a lot of things that you could involve children in that does not express sexual activity but is disgusting, reprehensible and exploitive nonetheless.

She and others pointed out, for instance, that pictures of children with no clothes on in a sexual context should be caught in the legislation. An amendment was made just this afternoon to include that as part of the definition.

One of the very important amendments made today was also in the section on the definition of child pornography. Caught under the new amendment that was made today is any written material or visual representation that advocates or counsels sexual activity with a person under the age of 18.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you what we get with this one. There is material being imported into this country from the United States. It was distributed to members of the committee. I had a look at it. This material advocates sexual activity with children under the age of 18. It promotes it. That is its reason for being. It promotes that sort of thing.

I found it disgusting. I did not even know something like this existed quite frankly. I did not know there were publications dedicated to this kind of thing but in fact it does exist. I have to ask myself, does the Canadian public accept this? I do not think they do. I still believe there are standards of decency that the Criminal Code should protect and this is a perfect example of that.

Last week we passed the stalking law which made it possible for the courts to put a lifetime prohibition against sexual molesters from hanging around parks, swimming pools and other areas where children frequent. I said that the month of June is a bad month for child molesters in this country and I say it again.

• (1845)

One of the things that interested me when I saw the publication that was distributed to this committee is it pays attention to what is happening here. It is very up on what is happening in Parliament. I see the hon. member across. His picture is in one of those as one of the bad guys, if you can imagine, for this organization which is promoting sexual activity between men and children. I hope we are all bad guys in the opinion of that particular publication. I am very proud to add my name to the list of bad guys who are opposing organizations like that. I say to that organization: "This is one bad day for you because we put that in the legislation and it is directed specifically at publications like yours so that it is in the Criminal Code and the people who enforce the laws of this country can take action. We are zeroing in on publications like yours".

It has taken nine years to have a pornography bill put before this House. It looks like it is going to pass and I am delighted that it is going to pass. If this is the last bill of the 34th Parliament then this Chamber has brought honour on itself again as it has over these last 126 years. I think there are millions of Canadians who, if they know or find out about the contents of the bill, will say that this Parliament has done well to pass this so we can protect our children from the kind of exploitation by individuals who make money and take pleasure from hurting the children of this country.

I commend all hon. members for expediting this bill and bringing us to the threshold where this will very soon become the law of Canada.

Ms. Lynn Hunter (Saanich—Gulf Islands): Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice in support of this bill.

As a mother and as a woman I know the need for this type of legislation. I share the previous speaker's repugnance at those who profit from this dissemination of child pornography. I think it is aimed at our most vulnerable. It does not just hurt children physically, it hurts them in their minds.

One of the joys of childhood is having the innocence of being a non-sexual person for a while or just being able to be free in their persona. They are not little boys or little girls, they are children and they have that innocence all around them.

Pornography is really an extension of an examination of power relationships because this is what is attractive to those who consume this material. It is their feeling of power. It was the women's movement that focused our attention on that aspect of it. The women's movement should be given some credit for the success that we are having in passing this legislation.

My question flows out of the comments by my colleague from Winnipeg that child pornography is really an extension of the soft porn which is pervasive in our society. I have often wondered, watching television, what some person who would be dropped in on our society would think of our society in watching television and the images it conveys. One thinks of what a powerful device television and visual images are, the soft pornography that is there and the marketplace. We think of the money that is behind pushing children and women as sexual beings primarily to the exclusion of any other aspect of their worth.

I would like to ask the hon. member what his views are as to the marketplace and its role in the dissemination of soft pornography because what we are examining today is an extension of that.

• (1850)

Mr. Nicholson: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member raises a very good point. It is one that I touched on concerning all the money that is involved with this. That is why there is such a substantive lobby against this. Any time we try to do something in this area very prominent Canadians, in one case one of the most prominent authors in Canada, can always be counted upon to criticize the attempts we might make in this area. It is a growing problem.

I believe that the people, as members of society, are not living up to their responsibilities to make sure that the entertainment that is available and that is widely shown to children is okay. All of us who have children have seen movies that come on television. I cringe at the amount of violence.

I say to my children, when they say they want to see such and such a movie, that it looks kind of violent. Then I find out that every kid in the class has been to see this movie. My mother-in-law told me about taking one of my children to see *Batman*. She could not believe how violent it was. She just assumed it would not be because the television program of the same name was children's fare.

It is a rude awakening for a lot of parents who may not be as careful as we might be or perhaps should be with regard to what is happening. It is out there and people are making money on this. They promote it with kids. The marketing that goes with these movies is designed to capture kids and get them to make their parents or older brother and sister take them.

That is why I worry about a subject like child pornography. I think it is actually becoming more difficult to get something like this before Parliament. It is almost as if we are fighting against a tide of commercialism and materialism that is hitting us. For my money it is becoming more difficult and that is why I am very moved by the fact that we have been able to get this bill because this will pay dividends in future years when it may become more difficult. I hope that is not the case.

I hope that in the next Parliament we can look at the suggestion of the member for Kitchener and address some of the other areas of pornography. However if the trend continues, and it is getting tougher and tougher, Canadians will say they are glad that this is on the books, that we went as far as we did in 1993 because that law is very useful in trying to stem the tide and hold at bay those individuals who would exploit our children and abuse them.

Mr. Tom Wappel (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to be able to take part this evening in the debate on Bill C–128. I say that because in all likelihood this will be the last speech that I will deliver in the 34th Parliament.

It is historic for me personally. I gave my maiden speech on the free trade agreement, which was the first piece of legislation brought forward in the 34th Parliament. Now I am giving my closing speech on the last bill before the end of the 34th Parliament in all likelihood.

I have listened very carefully to the hon. members who have spoken before me and I propose to take a different tack and a different angle on this legislation in the time that I have. The theme for my remarks this evening can best be summed up by the adage: Where there is a will there is a way. I would like to explain what I mean by that.

As the Official Opposition critic for the Solicitor General I am privileged to sit as a member of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Justice and Solicitor General.

• (1855)

In the time that I have sat on that committee I have found it to be an excellent committee which attempts at all times to be as non–partisan as is possible in a partisan institution. It has of its own initiative delved into topics which it believed to be in the best interests of society. In my view one of the features of Bill C–128 has its genesis in the review that the justice committee undertook with respect to crime prevention.

The committee decided that it would see if it could find out what the root causes of crime were and make certain recommendations with a view to preventing that crime in the long term.

One of the things that we decided to do was travel across the country to hear different witnesses in different locations. One thing that was consistent throughout all of the evidence, no matter where we went from coast to coast, was in the area of sexual abuse, particularly childhood sexual abuse, which was that the abused become the abusers. That is so important to recognize because, as we have heard in other studies, approximately 30 per cent of those who abuse young children are themselves young. They are young offenders. This is a shocking statistic and it demonstrates to me that the abused become the abusers.

At the time the justice committee proposed to go to Vancouver to hear evidence I was contacted by Detective Noreen Wolff of the Vancouver police department. She made me aware of an organization about which I had never heard before, and I heard the hon. parliamentary secretary say the same thing. This organization is the North American Man–Boy Love Association, NAMBLA for short. She sent me a copy of one of its publications.

Canadians could be forgiven for not knowing what NAMBLA is and what it stands for. I was shocked. What is NAMBLA and what are its aims? The following are direct quotes taken from the editorial page of the NAMBLA bulletin. In my view it is critically important that we read them into the record to understand what the bill and the amendments which were worked out in committee do, and why.

It says: "We work to organize support for boys and men who have or desire consensual sexual and emotional relationships and to educate society on their positive nature. We speak out against the oppression endured by men and boys who love one another and support the right of all people to consensual intergenerational relationships".

It continues: "NAMBLA condemns sexual abuse and all forms of coercion, but we insist there is a distinction between coercive and consensual sex. Laws that focus only on the age of the participants fail to capture that distinction for they ignore the quality of the relationship. Differences in age do not preclude mutual loving interaction between persons any more than differences in race or class".

What is the bottom line for NAMBLA? It advocates no age restriction whatsoever. Sex between a man and a tot, a young child, an infant, would be legal according to this insidious group. That is the reason it publishes its bulletin. In that bulletin it explains to people who prey on young children how to avoid prosecution, how to counsel the children that they prey on to avoid being detected, how to destroy material evidence, how to lie to

investigators and how to take the family of the victim into their confidence.

• (1900)

This is the kind of material that the NAMBLA bulletin puts out. We heard this from Detective Wolff. We heard about other horrendous cases of child abuse from Monica Rainey from Citizens Against Child Exploitation.

When we produced our unanimous report, the 12th report of the justice committee called *Crime Prevention in Canada*, there was specific mention of this topic. Detective Wolff was quoted as saying that we need to have laws to make it an offence to possess child pornography and NAMBLA-type material.

We saw the need to do something. What did the committee recommend? We recommended that the committee address the issue of child pornography and child sexual exploitation in the context of its review of the child sexual abuse provisions of the Criminal Code scheduled to begin in April of this year.

Lo and behold we in the committee did begin a review of Bill C-15, as it was then known, one of the bills passed in the previous Parliament. We again heard evidence from various sources relating to sexual exploitation against children. We knew by this time that the government was bringing forward Bill C-128.

We recommended as follows in June 1993: "This committee endorses the intent of Bill C-128 but urges that amendments be seriously considered at committee stage to make it an offence to possess material of any kind which depicts in any manner or advocates in any format the sexual exploitation of children". I have no hesitation in saying that I was instrumental in having that provision included in this particular report.

The flaw that I saw in Bill C-128, as it was originally proposed by the government on May 13, was that it did not include written material. I thought that was a very serious flaw. That is not to say that the bill was otherwise perfect because as human beings nothing we do is perfect and we have to understand that. However in my view there was a major flaw.

Why would someone be upset about NAMBLA? I hope everybody would be upset about NAMBLA and its aims. Even though I do not take any personal umbrage at this in issue 14(4), which is the most recent issue, my picture is shown. I am portrayed as a cad and an awful person for wanting to protect children from consensual loving relationships with men. I am proud to take that position. I do not believe that a young child has the capacity to consent to a sexual relationship with an older man.

That is not the only kind of written material we are talking about. One of the witnesses that came before us was Detective Sergeant Bob Matthews, and we have talked about him. He is from Project P. He also asked that written material be included. He said: "I am therefore recommending that the bill be amended to make it an offence to advocate adults having sex with children. This material in the form of the written word must be considered an offence to possess. Any publication that advocates adults having sex with children should be banned from this country". I say amen to that, and we discussed it.

He went further and he gave us another example. I do not for a moment intend to be graphic about this. During the course of the committee hearings, while seeing the evidence that was put forward by the witnesses, images were embedded in my memory which I wish were not there. To me they are like a brand stamped on a cow, something one can never get rid of or clear one's mind of. They were graphic images of visual representations of child pornography. This piece of work, and I use that word loosely, was taken off a computer bulletin board, accessible to anybody who could access a computer. It is written and there are no pictures. I will only read the front piece: "Warning. The story that follows is part 1 of an ongoing fantasy about the sex life of a very young, preteen girl, her friends and her mother. If you are in any way offended by this type of fantasy, please read no further and delete this file immediately. On the other hand if you enjoy reading stories about little girls having sex, then read on and enjoy".

• (1905)

What is in here is disgusting in the extreme, despicable in the extreme and is written in such a way as to glorify a little girl having sex with adults from infancy. That is something we can do without in this country.

I want to pay tribute to the government and the committee for listening carefully to the evidence and coming up with amendments today that dealt with these issues. I do say in passing it is unfortunate that the bill was only introduced on May 13 but it is not true to say we hurriedly went through it.

I have given the background of the two other committee reports. We have considered this issue very, very carefully for six months. We heard witnesses, professors and all kinds of interest groups and I personally asked them questions. None of them that I can remember did not include NAMBLA and its aims in their own definitions of child pornography, so these amendments came through.

I know the people of Canada are behind this bill. I want to read just one letter of many that I have received from constituents of mine. It is addressed to me and states: "I understand that the legislation, Bill C-128, to crack down on child pornography is before the House. This Bill C-128 will make it illegal to produce, sell, distribute or possess child pornography in films, videos and computer-generated images. It must be passed and should include in the definition, printed material as well as pictures".

I want to tell Mr. and Mrs. Leslie that indeed the amendment we passed today does include written material. I am very proud to have been a part of ensuring that is the case.

It also includes something else that Detective Matthews requested. It includes importation as part of the offence. We are talking about importing pictures and descriptions of gross acts of abuse against children. Who wants to import that kind of material? Who wants to read about Vicky's lessons in life? Who wants to read NAMBLA? Paedophiles. There is nobody else who wants to read this material, who wants to look at these disgusting pictures, these visual encapsulations for all time of sexual abuse of children.

If I have to choose between paedophiles and children there is no choice, ever. Our justice critic, my colleague from Cape Breton—The Sydneys said children are the most defenceless in our society and so they are. Who speaks for the children of Canada? We do in this bill.

Where there is a will there is a way, as I said at the beginning. Notwithstanding that this bill was introduced rather late and notwithstanding that there was real trepidation it might not pass, all members in this House saw the value of this bill. All members of this House worked hard to achieve a consensus so this bill could go through and our children can be protected.

That is why I am so very proud that I am associated with this bill and what it does to protect our children and why I am honoured that I am giving this, my last speech of the 34th Parliament, on this very important subject.

• (1910)

Mr. Jesse Flis (Parkdale—High Park): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that I am following the member for Scarborough West and the critic for the solicitor general. In his first term as a member of Parliament he has made a very significant contribution to better the standards of living and life in Canada. This member and all members who have spoken on this bill have made Canada the number one country as declared by the United Nations last year. Unfortunately we dropped to second place in 1993.

I have been exposed to child pornography and sexual abuse of children because of my 28 years of work with the Toronto Board of Education and many of those years in special education. As a consultant in special education I had teachers working in what they then called juvenile court. Today it is called the detention home.

It was always sad and heartbreaking to see young adults anywhere from 14 to 18 being locked up behind bars. While they were waiting appearance before the judge our Toronto Board of Education teachers had to do an educational assessment, psychologists did a psychological assessment and so on.

Once we got into the history of these young adults most of them had been subjected to some sort of abuse when they were young children or even infants. There were stories such as a mother bringing in men not to offer her body for sex but to offer the body of the little girl for sex with various men. This woman at 18 ended up in court year after year.

Young boys were caught for breaking and entering, assault or not listening to the teacher or their parents. They would run away and be picked up. Again we could trace their history to being beaten, harassed or sexually abused as children.

I am very pleased to add my support to this Bill C-128. I am a little perturbed that it took the government nine years to bring this bill to its final stage tonight or tomorrow when it gets its final blessing. I congratulate the hon. member for Kitchener for fighting so hard for his private member's bill. He wants to get re-elected and we need members like this, but I hope his party does not get re-elected because we cannot move important bills like this so slowly.

No one has mentioned where some of these children come from who are photographed in various sexual positions with adults. The hon. member for Scarborough West and I co-moderated a conference in the greater Toronto area on crime prevention and community safety and we had the police from all levels of government. One of the police officers brought journals of child pornography. It was sickening.

I learned after that conference that some of these children are sold by parents in developing countries because of the poverty there. The only way these parents could survive was to sell some of their children for child pornography. This message I will never forget.

I think we should keep it in mind as a country blessed with all the riches and resources we have in Canada that the first area of our budget we usually cut is official development or overseas development. The message I get is that charity begins at home.

• (1915)

Why are we sending millions to this country? Why are we sending millions here? The next time we are asked that question let us think of what that poverty does to the defenceless children in those countries. Some of them are coming to our country in the form of pictures and in the form of child pornography.

We have a duty not only to Canadian children but we have a responsibility as world citizens to children around the world. Every country spoke very wisely at the children's conference at the United Nations a few years ago. Then after the conference every one forgets the recommendations we have made.

I appeal to members of Parliament not only in this House but to those in parliaments and governments around the world regardless of what system they are using to govern their country to remember the children. They must not be sexually abused. They must be properly fed and clothed. They must not end up in the magazines of child pornography.

Everything else I wanted to say has been said but I wanted to put that on the record. Another point I want to put on the record concerns the kindergarten and grade one children who I see going to our schools who are being harassed at the corners and on the streets by street gangs. A group of young adults would get together and harass the young children going to and from school. That is not a good way to raise our children.

The other thing I feel sorry for with these five and six-year olds is the kind of drug trafficking and prostitution that they have to look at in broad daylight again on the way to school, on their way home for lunch and after school.

This is what I and the politicians in Parkdale—High Park are trying to wipe out. It is not only the politicians but we have excellent community involvement. We have excellent police support now. As the whole community gets involved we will hopefully clean up our communities so that at least the four and five-year olds who are going to kindergarten will not be exposed to the kinds of sexual acts that they see at that young age. What impression does that leave on these young minds?

I am pleased that this is the final bill. I am pleased that after the next election hopefully governments will change because we are finally seeing that we have to raise the standards in this country. We have to raise the standard of living and that includes health, education, safety in the homes, safety in the communities, safety in the public institutions and safety on our streets.

I will close there but again I congratulate all three parties and especially the members who were so active in committee and who were so active in the debate in the House.

Mr. George S. Rideout (Moncton): Mr. Speaker, I too wanted to just rise in my place and speak for a few short minutes on this particular bill and its fundamental effects that we are hoping it will have.

I do not think any of us in the House would argue that child pornography is right up there on the scale of one of those very heinous crimes that has been perpetrated on society from time to time. Even with all of the witnesses, some of whom questioned whether the legislation is proper and whether we are going in the right direction with respect to the legislation, it was unanimous that the

crime that we are trying to prevent is one worth trying to prevent.

It is only a question of methodology that we have to deal with. All of us on the committee felt that Bill C–128 was a valiant attempt. I know that the opposition has been saying over the last number of days and weeks that there has been lots of justice legislation coming before the House. We have been forced to deal with that legislation rather rapidly and this bill is no exception. It was introduced quickly. In fact we finished with the witnesses this morning in committee and then did clause by clause and used the rules to the best advantage in order to be here this evening and to have third reading.

• (1920)

An effort was made to get something on the books before Parliament is finished that will deal with child pornography. Whether we have achieved what we want with this legislation is the $64 question. I think we have made a valiant attempt.

In some respects I would have preferred to have more time to hear more witnesses because it was interesting even today listening to those people who are involved in the artistic community and in film, radio and television telling us about their concerns with respect to this bill. In that sense it would have been nice if we had had that input and time to really go over the exact words. However we find ourselves here in the opposition having to deal with an agenda which is to move this legislation quickly and our choice was between no legislation or this legislation with amendments.

We have taken the choice of this legislation with amendments. I think the amendments will go a long way toward helping improve this law. One of the key ones which was put forward by the opposition originally was in the area of the written word and that goes beyond what was first contemplated in clause 2 of the bill which is really amending clause 163.1 dealing with the definition and what constitutes child pornography.

We have added the written word as well. I think we were all shocked when we saw some of the things that were sent on their computers from one place to the other. The language and the explicit details which were contained within those computer messages shocked us to the extent that we felt the written word as well should be included.

My concern is that by including the written word we may find ourselves vulnerable to a charter challenge. However I guess in these circumstances one says: "Do we not do something for fear of a charter challenge or do we do something and then see what takes place afterward?"

In the area of child pornography I think we opt for the second alternative and do what we think is right. If it does not pass the test then we will try to correct it later on.

The other benefit in this legislation is the fact that possession, not just the importation, distribution and selling which is bad enough as it is, is also a crime. It is a crime because it is utilized by paedophiles and by others in order to entice children into child pornography and also into other areas of sexual abuse as I consider it. For that reason possession as an offence allows our police forces to step in and eradicate that.

I have one concern in what we have done today. I will say it succinctly and then finish. We have established under the Criminal Code a large body of law which deals with pornography and obscenity and all of those cases. This culminates in the decision by the Supreme Court of Canada in Butler. I am worried that what we are doing with this particular bill is setting that all aside and forcing the courts to now develop some new tests and some new frameworks which deal specifically with child pornography.

One of the recommendations which we received from the Canadian Film and Television Production Association was a recommendation that perhaps we should try to tie child pornography into existing legislation so that the body of law that has been built up over the years would be there and support child pornography. We would then not run the risk of facing a charter challenge and in fact losing the legislation that deals with child pornography.

I found their comments quite persuasive. I wish we had had the time to do that properly because there are some risks in what we are doing.

• (1925)

However, again we are faced with that same old decision of no law or this law. We are dealing with the heinous crime of child pornography. It is bad for those who view it but doubly worse for those children who are forced to participate in the actual production of child pornography. When I was faced with those decisions, I fell on the side of this legislation or no legislation.

I wish we could have done a better job but this is better than nothing.

Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to make a few remarks on this important bill which prohibits child pornography.

A number of members worked closely on the justice committee to ensure that a bill was passed before this Parliament dissolved. Although that may be imminent, we were all of the view that this was an extremely important matter. It was a matter that had been left too long for too many years with too much dithering. We would be collectively less than responsible if we failed to take advantage of the timeframe and the apparent political willingness of all parties to enact a bill which would address this very significant and growing concern in Canadian society.

The adaptation of the minister and his staff in working with the justice committee enabled the committee members to produce a bill that we felt was effective for the purpose intended. This is only the second time the bill has been before the House.

The bill in some respects limits a freedom some people in Canadian society would claim. Although not all people claim the right to use and abuse our children sexually, some do and it apparently is a growing market. In that context, we felt that we had an act and that we had a better bill.

It is important to provide some perspective, some background and some context from my point of view as an MP, as to why the bill is the way it is and why we feel compelled to pass it at this time.

The first of three things I have to say about the bill is that it was criticized at committee by very responsible, credible and leading spokespersons for the film industry, the television industry and the writers' organizations. These are all legitimate and most important segments of our Canadian cultural community. They have suggested that the bill goes too far in some respects. It is too much and not finely crafted enough to address their needs in their fields.

They felt that Parliament's prohibiting depictions of explicit sexual activity involving children would impair their ability to pursue work in their fields. It would have a chilling effect on their work in television, in the film industry, in the field of creative writing and other areas. The bill says that you may not depict in a film, in a video or in pictures explicit sexual activity involving a child. The bill defines a child as someone under the age of 18.

• (1930)

The bill also prohibits the use of the written word to depict explicit sexual activity. The bill also prohibits the advocacy of sexual activity between adults and children. That goes quite far. The last portion I have just described was an amendment made at committee because there was real concern about that area.

In fact some people in Canadian society over the last few months basically dared Parliament. Their little group, relying on their interpretation of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, dared Parliament and the Canadian people to try and infringe upon their right to advocate the sexual abuse of children, the sexual plundering of our youth. We were up to the challenge.

We were not fighting the people in the arts and culture community or the film or television industries. We responded to protect our youth. This is a technical issue and it is our view that when this bill mentions written matter, it is not just about something that can be read on a piece of paper. My colleagues have described some of the ugly sexual treatment of children that exists today in our society. It does not involve just that print on a piece of paper.

When we use the term in Parliament, and I am saying this for the record, we are talking about printed matter and written matter that is contained on a computer chip, in a computer memory, on a computer screen or on a television monitor. We are not just talking about written and printed matter on a piece of paper. We are talking about something that is written in a literate manner which portrays and depicts explicit sexual activity. I say that for the record, in case there is any doubt at any time as to what the intentions of Parliament were when it enacted this legislation.

The second element I wanted to address was the definition of a child. I simply wanted to put on record that from my point of view there was a question as to whether the children we wanted to protect would be those under the age of 18 or whether it would be a younger age, maybe younger than 17, 16 or 15. I do not know. The committee and members by consensus have chosen the age put forward by the government. They have selected it as anyone under the age of 18. I accept that as a necessary consensus to allow the bill to go forward.

The third item is the alleged chill effect the bill may have in the cultural and creative communities that produce films, books, art and movies.

There is a burden here on our police, our prosecutors and other public officials to ensure that when the Criminal Code is applied—and particularly this provision that we hope to enact now—that they are acting responsibly and take full account of the defences that are expressed in the bill.

Defences are set out very clearly in the bill which allow a person a defence in cases of medical, educational or scientific purpose in terms of works of art that have artistic merit. As someone has pointed out, surely today in museums of art in this country and around the world there are depictions of human beings under the age of 18 who may be shown in some form of activity that may fall within the explicit sexual activity definition of this bill.

• (1935)

I plead with reasonable-minded public officials in Canada to make sure that when they follow the provisions of this section of the act, they take into account all of those provisions.

I put to those people who complained there would be a chilling effect on television, in the film industry and in the writing industry that our goal is to protect our children and not to create a chilling effect on their creative talents. They have all the world at their disposal to write and create and portray. I say to them, leave the sexual activity out so that our children are not exposed to it, because it is not a part of our society's program. We do not want it and we do not give them licence to portray it in their creative work.

Last, I want to acknowledge the work of several members on the justice committee, not specifically but generally, who have worked in this area and have been very helpful in developing the bill. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice has also been constructive, as have the staff of the committee, in developing amendments to a bill that suits the needs, we believe, of all members of the House.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Fred J. Mifflin (Bonavista—Trinity—Conception): Mr. Speaker, this is probably the last late show we will have in this session of the 34th Parliament. Probably it will be the last late show ever in this 34th Parliament.

I want to run through quickly the follow-up on a question which concerns the chronology of events in Somalia in the middle of March, which pertains to the question. The chronology of events essentially were these.

On March 16 a Somalian prisoner was found beaten unconscious in his cell and he later died in custody. On March 17 the Minister of National Defence was briefed by senior military personnel on the situation. The next day, March 18, the defence department posted a news release on this beating death 260 kilometres away from the incident in Mogadishu. The release said the man had been detained and had died in custody. No further details were offered. No Canadian journalist reported seeing the release and it was not passed to Ottawa for distribution. On March 18, the same day, a master corporal was arrested and placed under close custody in

relation to this incident and three others were arrested on March 29 and 30, somewhat later.

The next chain in this event was on March 21 when two Canadian military investigators were sent to Somalia to investigate this death. On April 1 a reporter from a Pembroke newspaper reported the incident. The Minister of National Defence had not said anything up to that point in time. It is interesting that on March 19 reporters were not referred to the news release and indeed when questions were asked about the beating of this man by apparent military personnel there were no answers forthcoming.

• (1940)

The next event is that I questioned the government House leader in the absence of the minister on April 2. After the Easter break on April 19 I again questioned the Minister of National Defence and asked subsequent questions. On April 26 I asked another question on the same incident which essentially was: "Why did the Minister of National Defence not tell Parliament, the House of Commons and Canadians about this event?"

On April 28 the Chief of the Defence Staff in an interview stated that the Minister of National Defence knew that criminal intent might have been linked to the death as early as March 18. That is not surprising because on March 18 the incident had occurred. The man had been beaten to death. One soldier had been put in close custody related to the death. Surely there must have been some indication that there was something untoward. Indeed three others were arrested later in March, so the evidence was there. The minister was briefed.

I do not know what the minister was briefed on, but surely the minister must have been briefed on the detail of what happened. If nothing happened then, why on March 21 were special investigators sent over? I find it very disturbing and upsetting that in my question that I am following up here tonight of April 26, the minister in response to my question as to why she did not inform the House and why did she mislead and give inaccurate information, responded: "With respect to the event", to which I am referring here this evening, "to which the hon. member refers, I was briefed the next day that a death had taken place. It was not until March 31 that it was communicated to me that the death had been characterized—"

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Order please, time has expired.

Mr. Rob Nicholson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister of State (Agriculture)): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is pleased to ask a question on the last late show, I am pleased to answer in the last late show on behalf of the Minister of National Defence, soon to be Prime Minister of this country.

The hon. member has raised these questions here on numerous occasions and I will attempt to clarify for him the chronology.

First, the comments concerning the events that took place should be put in the context that Canada has received congratulatory messages from everywhere on the role our military—

Mr. Mifflin: That is not the issue.

Mr. Nicholson: I think that should be put as part of the record.

Mr. Mifflin: That's fine, that's fine.

Mr. Nicholson: Mr. Speaker, I hope that is added to the time because if I am being interrupted I want to be able to complete the answer if the member wants to know the chronology.

Some people have suggested that the minister and the Public Service neglected to publicly address the question. However in reality they have taken interest on many occasions in the course of action over the last couple of months.

Every incident that took place in Somalia was an object for investigation and in every case the Armed Forces advised the press. The details were made public and explained in a statement made by the minister in this House on April 26, 1993.

The member with all his military experience should realize that it is not the department's practice to report all incidents to Parliament. In this regard the incident that occurred on March 16 when a Somali citizen died while being detained by the Canadians. The minister stated in this Chamber that she was informed of this death on March 17.

On March 21 a team of investigators from the military police went to Somalia in order to investigate the facts concerning the death of the Somali citizen. Following this preliminary investigation on March 31 the minister was informed that a crime may have been committed. Charges were brought forward and the investigation of course continues.

As the minister stated she must take into account her double responsibility. One is to ensure the management

and direction of the Armed Forces and to assume the quasi-judicial functions within the military justice system. She had to counterbalance the necessity of informing the population and Parliament and the necessity of not bringing prejudice to the military justice. Conscious of her responsibility she requested advice on how best to treat her different roles and requested that the chief staff officer step up the commission of inquiry.

In closing I would like to remind the member, the House and all Canadians that the Armed Forces do an excellent job on behalf of this country and a job of which all Canadians can be proud.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Pursuant to Standing Order 38(5), the motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

The House adjourned at 7.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, June 16, 1993

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

[*Translation*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS PAGES

Madam Deputy Speaker: Before officially starting the day, I would like to say a few words about our pages in the House of Commons. On behalf of all members, I would like to extend our sincere thanks to all our pages for the dedication and zeal with which they performed their tasks, in the course of a year that has given them a chance to see Parliament in action and during which they made life so much easier for the members and the Chair.

[*English*]

It is always invigorating to see young people seated by the Speaker's chair. I hope some of them may one day return to the Commons to occupy their own seats.

I ask hon. members to please join me in wishing the pages success in their studies and their future careers.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Although they are leaving us I know they take with them great memories and experiences of Canada's Parliament, experiences they will share with others.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 31

[*English*]

GLOBAL VISION

Mr. Terry Clifford (London—Middlesex): Madam Speaker, as a former minister of youth I certainly appreciate your talking about young people today.

I am pleased to announce that a unique initiative for Canada's young people is beginning its 1993 edition. This program, now in its third year, is called Global Vision: Our Competitive Advantage. Global Vision's aim is to create a trade corps of young Canadians, ultimately enhancing a trade culture in Canada. They will commence studies at the University of Western Ontario on July 10.

I am also pleased to announce that parliamentarians from both sides of the House have recognized and put aside their partisan differences to see the value and importance of the initiative.

Parliamentarians for Global Vision is and has been the major sponsor for three years, along with various corporations, community and government ministries, provincial and federal, and particularly the minister of trade.

[*Translation*]

Madam Deputy Speaker: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired.

* * *

[*English*]

PUBLIC SERVICE WEEK

Mrs. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West): Madam Speaker, this week, June 13 to June 19, marks the second annual Public Service Week pursuant to my private member's bill which was given unanimous consent in the House and royal assent on June 4, 1992.

Never before have those who worked for the people of Canada more needed and deserved a sign of respect in the face of a government that has continued to browbeat and stomp its own employees into the ground in its desperate search for scapegoats to blame for its own mismanagement.

The government that preaches partnership and co-operation has instead created confrontation and conflict with its own employees, undermining morale and destroying productivity. Those who work for the people of Canada are looking forward to a change of employer,

just as the Canadians they serve are looking forward to a change of government.

* * *

• (1410)

NATIVE EDUCATION

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Madam Speaker, last week I was in Norway House and met with the council there. One of the things I found out was that 80 native children would like to go on to post-secondary education but do not receive any funding from the federal government.

When we have high unemployment and high welfare rates I think it is time the government reversed its policy, removed the cap and made sure these students, 80 of them who would like to go on to community colleges or universities, have that chance.

The minister of Indian affairs is in the House. I hope he takes a look at this letter, looks at these 80 potential students and provides funding for them so they can get off the welfare cycle and go to school.

* * *

MAGAZINE INDUSTRY

Mr. Bill Vankoughnet (Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington): Madam Speaker, I rise today to applaud the initiative of the federal government in the establishment this spring of a task force to review necessary measures to enhance its policy in support of the Canadian magazine industry.

Magazine publishers, such as the ones responsible for *Equinox* in my riding of Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington, have concerns about the future of their industry. The task force will ensure the instruments within the current policy framework that have fostered the development of the industry are up to date and effective.

The Canadian magazine industry is an important economic sector and is a vital part of Canada's culture and identity. The purpose of the task force is to propose measures that will enable the government to effectively carry through on its policy objective of ensuring that Canadians have access to Canadian information through genuinely Canadian magazines.

The task force has recently delivered an interim report to the Minister of Communications. My constituents look forward to the positive results from the interim report.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST LEGISLATION

Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands): Madam Speaker, as this Parliament comes to an end the Tory record demands review. In the last election the Prime Minister said he would introduce a conflict of interest bill. He had no choice since so many of his MPs were caught in scandals.

On November 8, 1989 the Tories introduced conflict of interest legislation which the Prime Minister promised would be clear cut and brutal. The only thing brutal about this bill is that almost four years after being introduced the government has never even called it for debate. What an example of Tory dedication to clean government.

The Conservatives have also seen fit to abandon legislation which would restrict the actions of lobbyists. No doubt the hordes of consultants and advisers who worked for free on the various Tory leadership campaigns are smiling today. In return for their backroom support and cash donations the government and the new Prime Minister will once again turn a blind eye to their practices.

A new broom sweeps clean. The Liberal broom is on the way.

* * *

[*Translation*]

TREES FOR THE FUTURE

Mr. Marcel R. Tremblay (Québec-Est): Madam Speaker, today I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Jocelyn Pépin, owner of the Pépin IGA supermarkets in Lebourgneuf, Quebec. On Saturday, May 31, I was with Mr. Pépin and his dynamic team when 400 trees were planted as part of environment month. Another 125 IGA grocers did the same, so that altogether 50,000 trees were planted across the province.

People have become very environment conscious and initiatives like these can be used to revitalize vacant spaces and public places. This five-year program is proving to be very beneficial for all concerned and I urge the public to remain involved and use this project to plant trees for the future.

[*English*]

ALBERTA ELECTION

Mr. David Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast): Madam Speaker, I want to congratulate Laurence Decore on a clean and dignified campaign in Alberta.

Edmontonians chose Liberals to fill all 18 seats in the capital city area. The Conservatives may have won the election but they certainly did not win my province's heart. I hope my fellow Albertans will not suffer too much under further Tory rule. At least they will have the opportunity to elect a new Liberal government next fall.

The Liberals won 32 seats in all. That is 23 seats more than before the election and the most since 1917. The Tories may have more seats but the Liberals have a much larger victory. I am confident this victory is a sign of things to come.

* * *

CANADA PENSION PLAN

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Madam Speaker, for several years my New Democrat colleague from New Westminster—Burnaby and I have been writing to the ministers responsible for the status of women and health and welfare about a heart-breaking case.

Helen Davis was married for 33 years and had eight children with her husband. She divorced him when he became a physically and mentally abusive alcoholic, but later she moved back in with her former husband to take care of him when he developed cancer. She has been denied a CPP survivor's pension because the government says she did not live with her ex-spouse for one full year before his death.

• (1415)

Survivor's benefits should be prorated to correspond to the number of years the couple has spent together. That this woman is forced to live in poverty after so many years of service to her family and to Canada is outrageous and an insult to women, particularly homemakers and seniors.

I urge the government to change this unfair policy now.

S. O. 31

CONSERVATIVE LEADERSHIP CONVENTION

Mr. Ross Belsher (Fraser Valley East): Madam Speaker, I want to extend my congratulations to each of the candidates in this past weekend's Progressive Conservative leadership convention.

Before and during the convention period all the candidates put forward their positions on party and public policy issues. As the economy is such a pressing issue, I am grateful that so much time was spent on proposals to stimulate the economy while maintaining our goals of reducing the deficit and increasing business opportunities.

I want to thank all five candidates for their contributions to the leadership process. Each of them worked hard to present their ideas to party members, and as a result of the debate which followed our party is stronger for it.

I have talked to many colleagues and many members who supported various candidates. All recognize the value of party solidarity and unity. I look forward to working with my colleagues in support of our new leader. We extend to her our best wishes and support in the future.

* * *

DISABLED PERSONS

Ms. Beth Phinney (Hamilton Mountain): Madam Speaker, the record of the Conservative government over the past four years has been dismal, particularly as it affects the disabled community. The $158 million budgeted by the National Strategy on the Integration of Persons with Disabilities works out to be approximately a loonie a year for each person with a disability, hardly something to brag about.

This government, while claiming concern for the disabled community, under the direction of the then Minister of Justice and soon to be Prime Minister, chose to scrap the Court Challenges Program which was so vital in protecting the rights of Canadians with disabilities. As well, the cap on Canada Assistance Plan payments put in place by the government has reduced the ability of the provinces to maintain and create programs for people with disabilities.

It is obvious the Tory commitment to the disabled rings hollow. Disabled Canadians do not want hollow gestures. They want recognition and integration into a society in which they can become full partners.

* * *

THE MEMBER FOR CALGARY CENTRE

Mr. Stan Darling (Parry Sound—Muskoka): I rise today to pay tribute to a very special person within our caucus, our party and this honoured place. I hope, Madam Speaker, that you will give me leave to mention the name of the government House leader, the hon. Harvie Andre.

This great bear of a man has been our leader in the House of Commons since February 1990. Before that he held many important positions in cabinet, including that of Minister of Industry, Science and Technology and associate defence minister, and he has been the longest serving minister responsible for Canada Post.

[*Editor's Note: And the Prime Minister and the Minister of National Defence having entered the Chamber.*]

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

• (1420)

Madam Deputy Speaker: I think the House will agree with me that the hon. member for Parry Sound—Muskoka should finish his statement.

Mr. Darling: Madam Speaker, he earned his Ph.D. in chemical engineering when he was only 26 years of age.

He has proudly served the people of Calgary Centre since 1972 and represented the interests of Albertans for over 20 years. Our pit bull once wondered why it was better to know Harvie Andre than to be Harvie Andre. That is easy to understand as he is so influential around the cabinet table.

All I know is that I am glad to say I know Harvie Andre, and on behalf of our colleagues I would like to say thanks.

TRIBUTES

PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY LEADERSHIP

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, I know the world-wide audience tuned in through CNN and C-SPAN will be delighted to have learned so much about Harvie Andre.

On June 21, 1957 the cabinet of the newly elected Prime Minister, John Diefenbaker, was sworn in, to which Mr. Diefenbaker welcomed the Hon. Ellen Fairclough as Secretary of State, thereby making her the first woman in Canadian history to become a member of the federal cabinet.

In the same month of June, 36 years later, I am honoured to enter the House today with the hon. Kim Campbell, who on June 25 will be sworn in as Canada's first woman Prime Minister in 126 years.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Mulroney: She is our first elected Prime Minister from British Columbia. She brings to the post of Prime Minister very impressive skills, a strong dedication to public service, a sharp sense of history and a very powerful love of Canada.

The leadership of a modern democracy in these difficult economic times is a great challenge. The most important responsibility of a Canadian Prime Minister as all members of the House know and as prime ministers of any political party have learned is the preservation and enhancement of Canadian unity.

[*Translation*]

Since I took on the responsibilities of Prime Minister of Canada nearly nine years ago, national unity has been my constant concern. Although we did not succeed in completely rebuilding the unity of Canada's constitutional family, I have always felt that Canadians everywhere have a profound love for and a fierce pride in their country. Whether we are from Bonavista, Baie-Comeau or Burnaby, whether we speak French or English, we all share the immense privilege of being Canadian citizens.

• (1425)

[*English*]

Canadians place great expectations and properly so on the shoulders of their elected leaders of all political

parties, leaders of the opposition, leaders of the House and leaders of the government. These must be borne seriously and serenely in sometimes quite difficult circumstances.

The member for Vancouver Centre has already demonstrated great poise, sound judgment and clear vision of public policy in three portfolios. I think she is marvellously equipped to discharge the responsibilities of the office of Prime Minister with efficiency, decisiveness and compassion.

I know I speak for all members of the House irrespective of politics when I say that all members and all Canadians wish her Godspeed and well.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Mulroney: I will be leaving this House and Parliament today. I can say that I would normally miss the members of the opposition but I have a feeling I will be seeing a lot of them. Some of them will be leaving with me too, including some who do not expect to. Public life is not always as rewarding as some people think. Imagine, 10 years of sparring across the aisle with Tobin and I do not even get a gold Timex.

[*Translation*]

I would also like on behalf of us all—I know he has been retained elsewhere because of an important commitment, but he should be here shortly—to congratulate the hon. member for Sherbrooke who won the respect and affection of thousands of Canadians during these past months. Members of this House are familiar with the remarkable qualities of the Minister of the Environment. I know they will also want to congratulate him on the dignity, the intelligence and the sense of principle with which he conducted his campaign for the leadership of the Progressive Conservative Party.

[*English*]

He and Michèle waged a superb campaign that we will always remember for its class and eloquence and his extraordinary contribution to the public policy debate. On behalf of all members, I wish the Minister of the Environment every success.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Mulroney: This is my last day in the House of Commons as Prime Minister of Canada. I have been very privileged to have been accorded the opportunity of serving with all of you. We seek to defend the interests of Canada in different ways and in different political parties but the commonality of our approach in the most important values is that at the end of the day everyone in the major political parties in this House has sought to defend their beliefs that Canada is and Canada must remain the finest united country in the entire world in which to live.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Mulroney: I would like to thank all members of my party who stood with me in difficult moments and worked so tirelessly to try to meet the commitments we made to Canadians. We did not always succeed but all of us always believed in Canada as do all members on the opposite side. I wish to extend my best wishes to all members of the opposition parties.

I know that the Leader of the Opposition will miss me. He usually does. By the way I think he too has been booked in Winnipeg or elsewhere today, but I just wanted to tell him that I am leaving Kim my briefing book and page one has just one word of advice: duck.

I will always keep fond memories of this place and all the friends I have made here. I will often think of you, my friends, Nunziata, Langdon, Audrey and Nelson. What will you be doing in retirement, Nelson?

• (1430)

Mr. Riis: Any ideas?

Mr. Mulroney: It was not you; it was someone else who spoke harshly of the Senate, was it not?

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Mulroney: I have to admit to not only respect and admiration but a great deal of affection for my hon. friend and all members of the House who have served Canada so well. I will think of you often, especially when I am sitting comfortably in my office between 2.15 p.m. and 3 p.m. every afternoon, knowing that another session of brilliant questioning and thoughtful and compelling answers will be beamed out across the nation in both official languages to an eternally grateful nation.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

Hon. André Ouellet (Papineau—Saint-Michel): Madam Speaker, I wish to join the Prime Minister in extending my warmest congratulations to the Minister of National Defence on her splendid victory last Sunday. I do so on behalf of the Leader of the Opposition who, unfortunately, had a number of commitments outside Ottawa today and has asked me to act on his behalf. I do so as well on behalf of all my caucus colleagues and of the Liberal Party of Canada.

I also would like to congratulate the four other candidates for the leadership of the Progressive Conservative Party. They all conducted a very good campaign. They showed great dignity and a strong sense of democratic principles. I would like to mention particularly the performance of the Minister of Environment, which reminds me of that of another distinguished colleague in this House, who happens to have the same initials—

Mr. Mulroney: John Crosbie?

Mr. Ouellet: —and who in 1984, won the hearts of many Canadians—

Mr. Clark (Yellowhead): Thank you, André.

Mr. Ouellet: —during another leadership race, but not for the same party.

[*English*]

I would like to single out the tremendous achievement of the member for Vancouver Centre in winning the support of her party. Not only will she become the leader of her party but, if I understand correctly, she will also be serving as Prime Minister of Canada in a few days.

This is a great achievement. However I advise her not to get too comfortable in her new job.

An hon. member: Summer job.

Mr. Ouellet: As many have said it might only be a summer job.

Mr. Beatty: Don't count on it, Andre.

• (1435)

Mr. Ouellet: She now has a prerogative that only she can exercise, and that is to go to the Governor General, ask for dissolution of this Parliament and call an election. I want to assure her that she will have the support of those of us on this side of the House for such an initiative.

What the current Prime Minister said in similar circumstances as Leader of the Opposition in 1984 could be our feelings exactly. We are ready, willing and more than able to deal with the writ.

Mr. Mulroney: We were.

Mr. Ouellet: Yes and we are. I am sure she will not abuse her peculiar situation, will respect traditions and conventions and will want to allow the people of Canada to duly elect a new government at the earliest opportunity.

In closing I would like once again to welcome the member for Vancouver Centre to the House as the new leader of her party and wish her both health and happiness in her future.

I did not realize I would not only have to respond to the Prime Minister on introducing the new leader of his party to the House but would have to listen to his last words in this Parliament.

[*Translation*]

We were friends years ago, when I went to school with the Prime Minister. Since then we have seen each other on various occasions, and especially in this House. On behalf of our party, I would like to wish him a happy retirement with his wife and children. I am sure, as he said earlier, that he will not be able to resist watching Question Period. There will indeed be some very good questions, because they will be put by members of his own party.

I want to say to the Prime Minister that the work he has done as a member and a parliamentarian has been extremely important. That is something we ought to recognize on occasions like this. Beyond the rivalry that exists among political parties, there are feelings of mutual friendship and respect which are very important. Although we are glad to see him go, we will remember a lot of nice things about him.

We wish you the very best.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon): Madam Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in welcoming the Prime Minister designate to the House.

[*English*]

I would like to congratulate her also on her election as the first female Leader of the Conservative Party. It is nice to have company.

Leadership races as we know are extremely challenging and the hon. Prime Minister-designate demonstrated good humour and determination throughout. We certainly congratulate her on her achievement.

[*Translation*]

The same could be said of all the candidates in this leadership race. I wish to congratulate them on making the effort. Politics is a very demanding profession, and although I realize politicians are not always popular, it is quite honourable to want to lead a party and help lead the country.

• (1440)

[*English*]

I suppose one could say there is the spirit of fellowship. However I guess that term is no longer appropriate. In the spirit of friendship I would like to remind the new Conservative leader that winning her party's leadership is just the beginning.

There are many challenges ahead. I look forward to debating with her the policies of the party she represents. I ask her to quickly act on her own policy of inclusiveness and call a federal election as soon as possible after June 25 so all Canadians can have a say. That will be very inclusive of all Canadians.

I suppose the question will be whether Canadians are ready for their first female Prime Minister. I say yes and this time they will have a very clear choice. We look forward to it.

Finally I say to the outgoing Prime Minister that he recognizes, along with prime ministers of all political parties, that no prime minister is ever as popular as when he is retiring. I want to extend to the outgoing Prime Minister, his wife, Mila, and their family my true best wishes. It is a difficult path. I know that everyone does their best in this role and they do it in the interest of the country. We may disagree but we do not disagree with the motivation to work on behalf of the country.

I just want to say that we appreciate the fact that the outgoing Prime Minister had a difficult task and he did it in his view in the interest of the country. We wish him and his family the very best for the future. Though the Prime Minister will be leaving this place, his spirit will most certainly be here in the woman who has been chosen as the leader of the Conservative Party.

[*Translation*]

Once again, Madam Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Prime Minister-designate. I wish you the very best in your new position.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

[*English*]

Hon. Kim Campbell (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs): Madam Speaker, I rise in the House today with a great sense of history to thank my colleagues and my supporters for providing me with the opportunity to be the first woman who will be sworn in as the Prime Minister of Canada on June 25.

I want to pay tribute to those of my colleagues who were also candidates in this wonderful race. Before I do so I might say that the convention was a very exciting one and there were members of other parties who attended. I had a moment of really extraordinary emotional enthusiasm and euphoria when I was sitting in the stands in my section at the Civic Centre and I saw the hon. member for Burnaby—Kingsway racing toward me with a great smile of enthusiasm. I wondered whether my appeal was really so wide. Alas, he was only accredited as an observer.

The hon. member for Halton—Peel, the hon. member for Etobicoke—Lakeshore, the hon. government Whip and the hon. Minister of the Environment played extraordinary roles as candidates in this leadership campaign.

[*Translation*]

I think it is particularly important to stress the role played by the Minister of the Environment. It was truly a race. It was a real opportunity for our party to show Canadians the wealth of talent that exists in our party. I want to congratulate all the candidates but especially the Minister of Environment, who will continue to play a central role in our party, in our government and in this country.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

[*English*]

Ms. Campbell (Vancouver Centre): I would like to speak for a moment about the history of women in our party. Recently I was reading the history of the House of Commons and was interested to learn something I had not known before. It was Sir John A. Macdonald, the first Conservative Prime Minister and the first Prime Minister of Canada, who stood in the House and proposed that votes be given to Canadian women. It was in fact a Conservative Prime Minister, Sir Robert Borden, who presided over the enfranchisement of women in Canada. Another Conservative Prime Minister, John Diefenbaker, appointed, as the Prime Minister said, the first woman to be a Privy Councillor and cabinet minister in the country.

• (1445)

Two Conservative Prime Ministers are in the House. The right hon. member for Yellowhead and the Prime Minister have also contributed to a number of firsts for women in the country in terms of cabinet portfolios. I am therefore honoured as a member of my party and a member of the House to be entrusted by my party with this leadership and to be able again to make history for women and for our party.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Ms. Campbell (Vancouver Centre): This is an emotional time for all of us on this side of the House and I think elsewhere. It is the last day in the House of Commons of our colleague and friend, the Prime Minister of Canada.

I want to say that when the Prime Minister announced his retirement there were many tributes paid in the House. Over the course of the coming months and years there will be many analyses of his initiatives and of his policies. I simply want to say again that the personal qualities of the Prime Minister were what touched so many of us on both sides of the House.

The Prime Minister and his family have made an extraordinary impact on this city. The presence of Brian and Mila Mulroney and their family has been a warm and friendly one in Ottawa. I know they are going to be missed not just by those of us who have had the pleasure of working with them, but by all the people in this city who have been touched by their grace, charm, warmth and wonderful devotion to the country. I thank them.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

Madam Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for Papineau—Saint-Michel most sincerely for his comments. I want to say that I am looking forward to working with him and all his colleagues, but especially the Leader of the Opposition. I greatly admire his personal qualities, and I must say I have done so since I was a teenager. I particularly want to thank the Leader of the Opposition for his calling right after my election as the leader of my party. I look forward to working with him.

[*English*]

I also want to thank the hon. leader of the NDP for her kind comments and to pay her a tribute as the first woman to lead a national party in the country.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Ms. Campbell (Vancouver Centre): All women have watched with admiration as the hon. member for Yukon has redefined the role of party leader, has been willing to assert her own point of view and has defined what it means to be a woman in that position of leadership. I want to tell her I admire her very much. I hope the burden of my admiration is not too much for her, combined with that of Bob Rae and Roy Romanow, and that she will be able to withstand it.

I want to conclude by saying that should the House meet again before the next election I will have the honour of taking that historic seat by virtue of the support given to me by the members of my party. I really look forward to the opportunity to take that historic seat as Prime Minister of Canada by virtue of the support given to me and my party by the people of Canada.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

• (1450)

[*English*]

WHITE SUPREMACISTS

Hon. William Rompkey (Labrador): Madam Speaker, yesterday Canadian peacekeepers concluded 29 years of successful and outstanding peacekeeping on the island of Cyprus. We honour today those peacekeepers who

concluded those 29 years of successful peacekeeping in the best traditions of the Canadian forces.

In view of that tradition, it was disturbing to hear last night on CBC reports of the infiltration of white supremacists into the Canadian forces. Several witnesses gave personal testimony to that effect. In fact, CFB Esquimalt did an investigation into white supremacy and the infiltration of white supremacists on the west coast of Canada.

I wanted to ask the Minister of National Defence and I will now ask whoever is representing her in the House of Commons when she was briefed on this report that was done by her department and what she did as a result of that briefing.

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, every allegation of racism is investigated.

In terms of the situation in Victoria, of the five individuals involved two in fact were dismissed and three were counselled that this type of behaviour was totally unacceptable, that if they were to perform or show evidence of that kind of activity in the future they would be dismissed from the Armed Forces in keeping with the policy of the Armed Forces.

Hon. William Rompkey (Labrador): Madam Speaker, the minister has said in the absence of the Minister of National Defence over the past few months that adequate policies were in place. Yet this investigation was done a year ago and never revealed to the Canadian public. Mr. McAleer operates a racist hotline in B.C. on which he advises white supremacists how to infiltrate the Canadian forces and use them for their own purposes.

In view of that obviously adequate policies are not in place. The government has known about this serious situation for months but has done absolutely nothing to stop it except evasion and obfuscation. Why has it done nothing to stop the infiltration of white supremacists into the Canadian Armed Forces?

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, the government has. I do not know why the hon. member makes the assertion that adequate policies are not in place. Adequate policies are in place.

The fact that we have speed laws does not mean we are not going to have speeders from time to time. We have adequate policies in place. From time to time unfit people do apply for the Armed Forces. When their activities are determined or discovered they are asked to leave.

The Minister of National Defence said earlier and in fact she has asked, and regulations are being drafted, that questions of racist activities, attitudes and organizations be made a more formal part of the initial recruiting procedure, more so than it has now. This is being done now in keeping with the strictures of the Canadian charter of rights.

It is totally wrong for the member to suggest the policies are inadequate. The policies are adequate and when this behaviour is discovered it is dealt with.

Hon. William Rompkey (Labrador): Madam Speaker, we do not know how widespread it is but we do know that a couple who operate a printing business in B.C. have claimed they met personally with over a dozen white supremacists, some of whom have now spread all across Canada to various units of the Armed Forces. They are reluctant to come forward publicly unless they have an assurance that something serious is going to be done.

• (1455)

I want to ask the minister on behalf of the government a question. In view of the mounting evidence that racists are using the Armed Forces which are outstandingly competent and recognized so all over the world, will the minister now institute a public inquiry into the matter?

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, the hon. member on the one hand acknowledges the competence of the Canadian Armed Forces and then on the other hand says they are not competent to deal with this issue and there should be a public inquiry. He should make up his mind.

Of course they are competent and of course it is dealt with. In fact this incident involving these five particular personnel was dealt with and dealt with appropriately. Two were dismissed and three have been counselled. Should they behave in that way any more they will be cashiered. I do not know what the hon. member wants unless it is pre-trial hanging.

Mr. Fred J. Mifflin (Bonavista—Trinity—Conception): Madam Speaker, this is not youthful folly. I want to assure the House and the government that members of the Canadian forces are as alarmed about this disturbing revelation as we in the Official Opposition are and as the government should be.

The substance of the issue is that members of supremacist groups are deliberately infiltrating the Canadian forces. They are using military facilities for training grounds and they are using barracks for contact points.

When did the government know about this? What did it find out about it and what did it do about it?

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, as I indicated in an answer to his colleague, the policy of the Armed Forces is well known and the retired rear admiral knows that.

He is questioning the competence of the Canadian Armed Forces to deal with undesirables in their ranks. They in fact are dealing with the undesirables in their ranks when they are discovered. They are dealing with it properly and in keeping with our traditions of justice, but they are dealing with it.

It is simply a false assertion to suggest that somehow there is a complicity, an acknowledgement or a wink-wink, that we do not mind if racists and white supremacists are infiltrating, to use that phrase, the Canadian Armed Forces. There is no evidence to support that accusation other than the comment on television by some white supremacist. When one thinks about it, it is in the interests of that kind of individual to spread that malicious, false information.

Mr. Fred J. Mifflin (Bonavista—Trinity—Conception): Madam Speaker, the disturbing thing about this is that these racist members have been told to keep a low profile. They do not attend meetings and they keep out of sight so they are very hard to recognize.

There is evidence that a well organized group is infiltrating the Canadian forces throughout Canada. Civilians are being threatened by these groups. They are afraid to even speak to the authorities for fear of repercussion. The base military police have completed an investigation but the base commander will not make the information public.

Will the government undertake to make public the investigation findings to expose this cancerous element of Canadian society serving undercover in the Canadian forces, of which there is plenty of evidence?

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, with due respect, I wish the retired animal—admiral—

An hon. member: Party animal.

Mr. Andre: —the retired admiral would bring forward his evidence.

An hon. member: There was a television program on it.

Mr. Andre: I saw the television program and that is an example of the kind of journalism I will not miss when I leave this place.

He just suggested that these individuals were told to keep a low profile. By whom? Is the implication that the military told them to keep a low profile? Of course not. If the military discovered them it would kick them out.

What is the hon. member suggesting beyond what is in place now? The regulations are in place. When this type of behaviour is discovered the individuals are dealt with. The policies are there to try to prevent to the extent humanly possible these types of individuals getting into the Canadian Armed Forces because they are not needed, not required and not wanted.

When they are discovered there and discovered to be acting in an improper manner, belonging to these groups and evidencing behaviour that everybody recognizes is improper, they are dealt with. The Canadian Armed Forces are in my view the finest military establishment in the world and I have every confidence in them.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

* * *

• (1500)

THE ECONOMY

Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. Clearly today we have wished the Prime Minister well, but sadly I am not sure the country has fared so well.

Canadians today, after nine years of Conservative government, will be asking themselves several questions. Are we better off in terms of health care? Do we have a better educational system? Do we have fewer unemployed? Do we have less poverty? The answer to all those questions is no. Do we have a higher debt? The answer to that question is yes.

While there will be an election soon and we will hear many promises, there is still an opportunity for this Prime Minister to make some changes now.

Will the Prime Minister commit to not proceeding further with the NAFTA bill, the trade bill between Canada, the U.S. and Mexico, so Canadians can have their say during a federal election? Will his government give Canadians back some hope and bring forward a real plan to get Canadians back working?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, I urge my hon. friend to read a speech made yesterday in Washington by the premier of Ontario, the Hon. Bob Rae. In a very effective and impressive speech he indicated that matters such as productivity and economic growth would drive recoveries and that his government had learned that we cannot borrow and spend our way to prosperity, that we must control costs and generate true growth in the private sector. This is exactly what we are trying to do.

I urge my hon. friend in her own self-interest because I am out of here now. I am not a politician. I am a statesman so I am trying to help her. I say with affection for her to read Bob Rae's speech. I think she will find upon reflection good cause to repudiate many of the policies that her party, not her, has foisted upon her from the thirties and the forties.

We are now in the nineties. It is time to understand that true growth can only be generated through the private sector and a re-energized country. That is what we have done.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon): Madam Speaker, it is difficult, even impossible, for the Prime Minister to defend his government. He refused to answer questions on Canada's present situation, but it was this government's responsibility to set policies. We have 1.5 million unemployed people, 2.2 million on welfare and 4.2 million poor people here in Canada. All these people do not need rhetoric, they need jobs. It is because of the government that we have such a disaster here in Canada. They need a fundamental change.

Does the Prime Minister really believe that he and his Quebec caucus can hope to defend an economic policy which has put almost half a million Quebecers out of work?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, I would be very interested to know what my friend considers to be the criteria of success for the economy of a large industrialized country like Canada. Does she believe that the inflation rate is important? I submit to her that the inflation rate in Canada today is the lowest in 30 years. Does she believe that interest rates are important? They are at their lowest level in 20 years. Does she believe that the economic growth rate is important? The rate of economic growth and the rate of employment growth in Canada are the highest of all the G-7 countries, of all the large industrialized countries in the world.

Of course, we have just been through a difficult recession, it is true. We see the effects all over and we deplore them. People are facing the same realities now in France, England or Germany. It is like that almost everywhere. But Canada is coming out of this recession strengthened and greater, with a tremendous capacity to generate lasting new prosperity for our nation's young people. I am not saying that it is perfect, but the most important elements of an economy are found in Canada, number one in the world.

[*English*]

Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon): Madam Speaker, I am shocked the Prime Minister in leaving office would not want to recognize the real pain across the country from coast to coast to coast of unemployment and of poverty which has radically increased during the last nine years. There is great pain across the country. The Prime Minister is leaving this government and leaving Canada with the highest number of unemployed ever in the history of Canada and the highest debt ever in the history of Canada.

• (1505)

I said earlier that the Prime Minister does have one last chance to do something. Will he not take advantage of the announcement of the minister of trade that he is not going to run in the next election, that he is going to

retire, and retire the disastrous North American free trade deal along with the trade minister?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, in his quite remarkable speech delivered yesterday in Washington, Premier Rae indicated that his government realized it could not isolate itself from the currents of international affairs and from the trading, economic and fiscal responsibilities that exist in North America.

I hope I am not being presumptuous; my mother tells me presumption is still a sin, but as a result of that I expect an early endorsement of NAFTA from the Government of Ontario.

Ms. McLaughlin: Oh, come on.

Mr. Mulroney: I hope I did not offend my hon. friend, but I want to tell her this. If you are opposed to NAFTA, you are opposed to free trade. Audrey, you know what happened in that election. If you are opposed to NAFTA you are trying to roll back progress. You are trying to take Canada back to the protectionism of the thirties, the forties and the fifties.

We favour a modern, vigorous outgoing approach that will generate new wealth and new jobs for all young Canadians.

* * *

[*Translation*]

RACISM

Mrs. Shirley Maheu (Saint-Laurent—Cartierville): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Defence. I have in my hand a copy of a letter from B'nai Brith to the minister, dated May 6, asking what she intended to do to eliminate racism in the Armed Forces. So far, this letter has not been answered. Why is the minister refusing to look into this matter? Why is she neglecting her duty as minister?

[*English*]

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, of course the minister has not refused to deal with it. As for the letter, I suggest to the hon. member had it been given to Canada Post it would have been delivered and answered by now. It must have been sent some other way.

In answer to her colleagues and her seatmate, I have explained the policies of the Canadian Armed Forces are clear. They are there. It is unacceptable for members of the Armed Forces to exhibit, show, demonstrate or act in a way that is racist or white supremacist. A number of other activities are prohibited as well. That comes with the privilege of wearing the uniform of the military of Canada.

The policies are in place and are being implemented. That does not mean incidents are not going to happen any more than it means, as I said earlier, that just because there are speeding laws there are not going to be speeders from time to time.

The reality is that policies are in place. They are being implemented by a very professional Canadian Armed Forces and there is no reason for the public to be overly concerned.

Mrs. Shirley Maheu (Saint-Laurent—Cartierville): Madam Speaker, this is no laughing matter and it has nothing to do with Canada Post. On behalf of all Canadians who are upset and disturbed about racism, I would like the Prime Minister to answer this question, please.

[*Translation*]

A year ago already, a defence department investigation in British Columbia revealed that neo-Nazi groups had infiltrated our military. This government's inaction is totally unacceptable. When will the minister launch a public inquiry on neo-Nazi infiltration of the Armed Forces? Through her negligence, will she allow these undesirables to receive military training at our taxpayers' expense?

[*English*]

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, the hon. member keeps making the false accusation that nothing was done. There were five individuals involved. They were dealt with. Two are no longer with the Armed Forces. Three were counselled. The matter was dealt with. I wonder why the hon. member feels it is reasonable to keep suggesting nothing was done when something was done.

An accusation has been made by a white supremacist on television that there are others. I suggested to her seatmate as I suggest to her: Provide some proof and I

guarantee the Canadian Armed Forces will follow up that evidence and take the necessary action.

• (1510)

Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. The government House leader fails to take seriously the nature of the question being raised today.

Only three weeks ago in Ottawa, the nation's capital, we saw a near riot between members of the Heritage Front and those who oppose that philosophy. We saw people being injured and we saw arrests being made. We saw a subsequent demonstration a short time later in Toronto.

Organized racism is real and visible in Canada. Notwithstanding the excellent reputation of the armed forces, regrettably it is apparent that it is real and visible within our military organization as well.

On April 26 the Minister of National Defence announced a military commission of inquiry behind closed doors "to provide insight into the problems experienced by the Canadian forces in Somalia". That was a beginning.

We now understand as a result of allegations brought not by a supremacist but by two people in small business who run a print shop in Victoria that as many as a dozen members of a supremacist organization have visited them seeking paraphernalia.

We are asking the minister and the Prime Minister the following: Will the military commission of inquiry announced by the Minister of National Defence be expanded to a full and open public commission of inquiry into the use of the military by white supremacist organizations in the country? Will the government move to put an end to this cancer in Canadian society?

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, the hon. member wants to have it both ways. He wants to suggest he has confidence in the military and he wants to have a public inquiry, a kind of witch-hunt, based on allegations for which there is no evidence.

We are talking about 70,000 uniformed personnel. Given the numbers involved, from time to time people do apply who really should not apply and should not be permitted in the armed forces. When they are discovered they are dealt with.

The policy is there. It is very clear. The Minister of National Defence has stated that racism and racist attitudes are completely unacceptable in the Canadian forces. The Canadian forces do everything possible to ensure that policy direction is followed.

If the hon. member has evidence where in fact this is not happening he should produce that evidence. I assure him that it will be dealt with.

Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte): Madam Speaker, the Minister of National Defence announced the military probe in April. She cited four reasons for the probe. She did not mention at the time that last summer in Victoria there had been a full SIU investigation into racist activity, white supremacist activity, in the military in that region.

In a *Times* column, military spokesman Major Don Roy confirmed a full investigation and made clear that no result of that investigation would be made known unless somebody successfully petitioned for it under the Access to Information Act.

I believe Canadians believe as I do, that we ought to have an open public commission of inquiry to end now the spread of this cancerous racism in Canadian society and in particular any use of our military for these despicable beliefs and activities.

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, my hon. friend and I share many things, including the view that racism is of course a profound evil and the bane of the existence of any so-called civilized society. Unfortunately we are a country of 28 million people and we are going to have our share of kooks, nuts and racists. This in no way reflects the great and quite noble traditions of Canadians.

I remember when I came in as Prime Minister one of the things that struck me was the fact that for decades requests had been made for a royal commission of inquiry into the Nazi war crimes and the fact that Nazi war criminals might be living in Canada. I shared the view that this was a horrible thought to consider, and we immediately appointed a royal commission. I think prosecutions ensued.

Another matter came up. I remember my hon. friend's active and constructive participation in the question of racism directed against Japanese Canadians. For 40 years Japanese Canadians had suffered extreme damage. It was a profound racist act by the Government of Canada. This government came in and corrected it with the help

of all members of the opposition. I thank my hon. friend for it.

• (1515)

That is the kind of leadership all political parties tend to follow in Canada. Those two instances were powerful signals to those kooks and nuts in Canada that they were a tiny minority and would be dealt with vigorously and effectively by a vigilant citizenry.

* * *

TRADE

Mr. David Barrett (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. It concerns jobs and provincial jurisdiction under the Constitution.

Before I ask this question I wish to thank the Prime Minister for reminding all Canadians that citizenship is treasured and no one should ever lose it because of race.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Barrett: On this last day of the Prime Minister's leadership in the House I want to remind him of a letter sent to him on May 27, 1993 by the premier of British Columbia relative to a recent panel on logs from the province of British Columbia.

The Prime Minister received this letter from the premier of British Columbia, Mr. Harcourt. It expresses concern over the fact that under a section of NAFTA which has been passed by the House there is risk that the provinces will lose jurisdiction of control of resources, specifically control of whole logs and the export control of whole logs without the application of secondary or tertiary manufacture which leads to jobs.

Before the Prime Minister leaves office can he assure all British Columbians that the signed North American free trade agreement will not in any way take away provincial jurisdiction of the control of the export of whole logs from my province of British Columbia?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, if my hon. friend is asking whether under NAFTA the provinces lose jurisdiction over the control of natural resources, in this case logs, the answer is no.

Mr. David Barrett (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to hear the Prime Minister take that position.

Now I want it clearly understood that because of that position the Prime Minister is prepared to send a letter to the President of the United States and the President of Mexico interpreting that the statements now coming out of Washington, D.C., *vis-à-vis* B.C. logs are totally incorrect and the panel's decision is incorrect in suggesting that the province does not have jurisdiction over those logs. It will say clearly to all Canadians, particularly British Columbians, that no province will lose jurisdiction under this act and, if that is so, the act will not be implemented as it is presently written.

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, my hon. friend knows that in the past with regard to free trade and again with regard to NAFTA, questions of culture were raised and the answer was no. There were questions on whether we were going to export all our water and the answer was no. There were questions on natural resources. Questions on Canadian blood were raised and the answer was no.

My hon. friend knows the answer to his question. I gave him the answer. He asked whether I am prepared to write to the President of the United States and the President of Mexico. I am so confident of the position I have just given my hon. friend that I am prepared to resign on this question.

* * *

BOSNIA

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre): Timing has always been his problem, Madam Speaker. I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Yesterday in Question Period in response to a question I put, the minister said in *Hansard* that a decision had been made concerning the feasibility of sending more soldiers or other Canadian military forces to Bosnia.

Considering that this is the last day on which the House will be meeting for some time it is very important

that we understand what that decision is so Canadians will know exactly the seriousness and the implications of that decision.

I want to ask the minister: Are we sending more troops to Bosnia? Will the mandate of our troops which are presently in that territory be changed in order to become more of a combat role? Where will the resources and equipment come from, considering that the defence minister has always said there is no more capacity for peacekeeping?

• (1520)

Concerning the serious implications for our troops and their families I hope the minister will be able to respond directly to these questions.

Hon. Barbara McDougall (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Madam Speaker, before I answer the question, which I will as usual in a very precise manner, let me just say there has been a lot of talk today in the Chamber about women, the leading role they have played and their role in the House with the leaders of two national parties being women.

I recognize that you are not the first woman to occupy that chair, but I do think on this day I would like to acknowledge what a great job you have done as well.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mrs. McDougall: In response to the hon. member's question, let me just say that I apologize for not checking the "blues" because that is the opposite of what I said. What I said was that the decision had not been made.

I had always said that we are close to the end of our capacity to send people, that we would look at what we had. We have not reached a decision because we have had no request from the United Nations to be a part of that additional troop. However it is well aware of the limits of our capacity to provide additional troops and resources, and that if we were to do so it would be small rather than large. My answer was intended to be that we had not yet reached that determination.

I apologize to the hon. member and the House for not checking that *Hansard* was correct.

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre): Madam Speaker, I have a supplementary question.

If the minister is saying that Canada has decided not to send troops, may I ask specifically what our intention is for the troops that are already in Bosnia? Will we be agreeing to a change in their mandate as outlined under the resolution passed by the security council and contained in the report by the secretary-general, which in effect says that the troops will now be asked to provide military protection to civilians in these safe havens and clearly substantially alters the mandate and rules of engagement by troops?

If we are going to make that commitment what will we be doing to make sure that our troops are properly equipped and given the proper resources? It is quite clear from all reports that the present troops there are not adequately equipped to meet the kind of task that the UN has now set out for the UN protective force in Bosnia.

Hon. Barbara McDougall (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Madam Speaker, before we get the precise description from the United Nations as to what might be required of Canadians who are doing such an excellent job in Bosnia and in Croatia it is very difficult for us to say what we might do by way of additional resources or equipment for them.

Let me assure the hon. member and Canadians that we have never yet sent troops to accomplish a mission for which we have not equipped them adequately, and we will do that again. We will not allow our troops there to be inadequately equipped. We have never done that and we will not do it now.

* * *

TOBACCO SMUGGLING

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Solicitor General.

Almost every night machine gun fire is heard and speedboats are running the rivers at full speed in the dark with their lights turned off pursuing criminal activity. I am not describing life in Sarajevo or Mogadishu. I am describing the practice of tobacco smuggling on the St. Lawrence River near Glengarry in my riding.

I want to ask a question of the Solicitor General on the last day of this Parliament. What precisely does the government intend to do to stop this illegal activity which endangers the lives and safety of my constituents? What is he going to do to ensure that we stop losing billions of

taxpayers' dollars in this terrible process that is going on right now 50 miles from Parliament Hill?

Hon. Doug Lewis (Solicitor General of Canada): Madam Speaker, I agree with my hon. friend that the situation is serious. The government has been moving on several fronts to deal with it. I am not in a position to reveal all of those on the floor of the House of Commons. Suffice it to say, we have increased funding to provide for increased surveillance on the policing side of things as well as on the customs side of things.

I might also say that with the opposition's help we have recently amended the proceeds of crime legislation to enable us to move on another front.

I make no bones about it: It is a serious situation and it is one that we are moving on. We are making an effort to try to improve the situation.

• (1525)

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Madam Speaker, I remind the minister that at the present time there are only 24 RCMP officers to patrol the whole area, including ports of entry, and to take care of the criminal activity that is going on.

Will the minister commit his government and particularly the Minister of National Revenue to stop cutting back on customs positions at the very least? We should add to the complement of people who are there now so we can bring back some safety and some sanity before people get killed as they did three years ago when we had the insurrection at Akwasasne.

Hon. Doug Lewis (Solicitor General of Canada): Madam Speaker, I am in a position to advise my friend that steps are being taken to supplement the number of customs and RCMP officers on the scene.

* * *

CHRISTINE LAMONT

Mr. Stan Wilbee (Delta): Madam Speaker, I direct my question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Two weeks ago, a home was levelled in Managua by an explosion of a stash of missiles. Investigators of the blast found a stash of documents and fake IDs. Apparently six pieces of the IDs had a picture of Christine Lamont, some with her name and others with a fictitious Lisa Lynn Walker.

Could the minister tell us what she believes to be the significance and the reality of this information?

Hon. Barbara McDougall (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Madam Speaker, late last week we learned of the article in the Managua newspaper *Barricada* which featured photographs of Christine Lamont's ID cards. The article itself described documents that were found with a large arms cache that was discovered recently in Managua.

The newspaper claimed that the documents concerned plans to kidnap a number of prominent Latin American business and political leaders. At the same time Nicaraguan authorities informed our ambassador that there were 306 foreign passports found with the arms cache, including three Canadian passports. They asked Canada to verify the authenticity of the Canadian passports. The passport office has confirmed the authenticity of two passports issued to Christine Lamont in Ottawa in November and December 1988 and one passport issued to David Spencer at the same time. One of the passports had been altered.

I want to say that this development does not affect our approach to the Lamont–Spencer case. We will continue to be governed by our respect for due process and fairness to all Canadians imprisoned abroad. We will continue to press Brazil to ratify as quickly as possible the transfer of offenders treaty which would allow Miss Lamont and Mr. Spencer to return to Canada to serve their sentences.

That treaty has passed the lower house of the Brazilian congress and is now under consideration in the senate. I also want to assure all hon. members that while we are proceeding with that process, we will provide all possible consular services to Miss Lamont and Mr. Spencer and monitor prison conditions as we do for others who find themselves in this situation abroad.

* * *

STUDENT LOANS

Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—St. Clair): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State who on June 10 said that she was engaged in

extensive consultations about improvements to be made to the student loan program and that the program was to be enhanced to provide students with increased support.

Is it not a fact that the National Advisory Group on Student Financial Assistance had been ignored for a year and finally had to demand a meeting which was granted on June 2? Among other things at that meeting, rather than consultation, they were told that the student loan limits would be unchanged and that the government's promise to remove the 3 per cent tax would not be fulfilled.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Monique Landry (Secretary of State of Canada): Madam Speaker, the first comment I would make is that the hon. member in a statement in the House yesterday, June 15, claimed that I had already met the advisory group in question, which means that he was not up to date. I do not need to wait for the hon. member's recommendations. I met that group because I thought it was very important to continue the consultations first begun by my predecessor.

The consultations were held when my predecessor occupied the position. I have consulted as well and the government is about to review the student loans project. We are aware of the needs of the program and we have made the commitment. Personally, I am very proud and very pleased with the consultations I held a few weeks ago with the advisory group in question.

• (1530)

[*English*]

Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—St. Clair): Madam Speaker, I have a letter in my possession which was widely circulated that constituted a demand for a meeting that was finally held on June 2. The question was why so long and why so little as a result.

Is it not true that the reforms which have been proposed by the government, which have not yet been tabled, are widely opposed by virtually every university sector represented on the advisory group because it neither enhances nor increases student support? In fact it does not do anything more than restrict accessibility still further, especially for part-time students.

Why can the government not engage in real consultation to produce a program that recognizes the reality of students, for example the fact that student loan limits have not been changed since 1984?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Monique Landry (Secretary of State of Canada): Madam Speaker, I am sorry, but my colleague is very badly informed. I had what I thought was a very good meeting with the advisory group. Of course, I told them about the changes I wanted to make, carefully explaining to them that the changes desired by the government were intended first of all to improve the program for students so that they could have more money every week and to reduce the cost of the program for them.

I think that this government has been very consistent in its student aid. The program has served students very well over the years. We are trying to improve it so as to give them better access to education. I must say that I am very proud of our achievements in the whole area of support for students in recent years.

* * *

[*English*]

FISHERIES

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys): Madam Speaker, my question is for the minister of fisheries.

It has been over two months since the minister announced his aid package for east coast fishermen. Fishermen and women in Cape Breton are still waiting for approvals to their applications, the applications themselves and in many cases details concerning the program.

These people are very concerned about how they are going to make their payments on their boats and how they are going to support their families.

Would the minister in order to expedite this program agree to decentralize the administration of this program so authority for approving programs and applications could be given to local officials of Fisheries and Oceans and Employment Canada?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency): Madam Speaker, there is no delay with reference to the administration of this program. This is a complicated program involving trying to assure assistance goes to certain fishermen of the maritime area.

We are dealing with an area where there is a mixed stock fishery, where most fishermen are licensed for more than one species and where they are not restricted for the most part just to the catching of groundfish. It is a program to try to compensate those who are primarily dependent on groundfish stocks for their livelihood. It is quite a complicated situation.

As I told the House yesterday we have received 458 applications, I think it is so far, by June 15 of which 161 have been approved. I do not have the information right before me. With respect to the hon. member, these are fishermen I am talking about. We have received another 1,199 applications from fish plant workers; 722 are in process; 397 have been approved; 80 so far have been declined. We have approved 43 fish plants, I think, as being eligible under the program, so everything will proceed much more quickly in the future.

We have to remember the program only becomes operative if plant workers find they cannot get work this year and their UI runs out, or a fisherman discovers that he cannot catch fish in the area where he normally fishes and this is found to be so by the department of fisheries, where he is not going to be able to qualify—

Some hon. members: Time.

Mr. Crosbie: This is a complicated situation and already the NDP members have very little patience. They do not want to hear how anyone applies for the program, how they get assistance—

Some hon. members: Order, order.

Mr. Crosbie: Do not pretend to be interested in this subject at all, if you are not prepared to listen to the answer.

Madam Deputy Speaker: We may get the end of that answer on a supplementary by the hon. member for Burin—St. George's.

• (1535)

Hon. Roger C. Simmons (Burin—St. George's): Madam Speaker, the minister does not get it. This is not the time for bluster. People are hurting out there. Some of them have had no income for months. They would like to go fishing if they could but there are no fish out there.

Why does the minister not recognize just what the problem is? They are looking to the minister for some help. Does he get his jollies out of making them beg some more? Why does he not get a hand on this one, go into the department and straighten it out once and for all? It is going nowhere unless he puts a firm hand on it.

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency): Madam Speaker, if this was a time for bluster the hon. gentleman would be gone with the wind.

Neither is it a time—as somebody just down from me whose name I will not reveal said—for sanctimoniousness. This is the time for trying to give assistance to those who need assistance for the reason that the groundfish fishery is not what it should be. The stocks are not there.

As I just explained to the previous questioner we have a very complicated situation where not all fishermen are going to be eligible; just those who were dependent upon groundfish and cod primarily. This is very difficult.

It is all in place. I hope we will be to handle it and perhaps improve the program if we find this is inadequate. I trust the government will then take steps to improve it but it is a very complicated situation.

* * *

HON. JOHN FRASER

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance): Madam Speaker, today it is my pleasure to rise to pay tribute to one of our most distinguished colleagues, one of the most distinguished members of the House, our friend and colleague, the hon. member for Vancouver South, the Speaker of the Chamber, the Hon. John Fraser.

Most of us know him simply as Mr. Speaker for that is the role that he has played with great humour and skill over the last seven years. Like many of us, I have also been privileged to know him as a colleague, a friend and as a member of the party of which I am a member.

On behalf of the party and on behalf of the Government of Canada I am therefore happy and proud to salute the remarkable contribution that he has made to the institution of Parliament and in advancing Canadian democracy.

The Hon. John Fraser has been a member of the House for almost 21 years and sat for almost 11 years as a member of the opposition. As an opposition member he was a principled individual who pursued the important issues that concerned him most and those which were of concern to the people and the region he represented.

Most notable among these issues was the environment which I suppose stems from the fact that he really is a great outdoorsman. He is an avid hunter and fisherman, an ardent skier. One of his daughters is a world champion.

It is important to note that in his campaign of 1972, long before the environment was a popular issue, it was one of the principal elements of his personal electoral platform.

As Minister of the Environment in the government of the right hon. member for Yellowhead he was the first Canadian minister to begin acid rain treaty negotiations with the United States. It was this vision and groundwork which helped our government to conclude an historic acid rain agreement with the United States some years later, an accord which helps to safeguard our national heritage for future generations. The establishment of a national park on South Moresby Island and the Greening the Hill program are just two more examples of the kind of leadership the hon. member for Vancouver South has shown.

• (1540)

I have every reason to believe that even in his retirement from this place he will continue to speak out publicly in favour of sustainable development, environmental protection and its enhancement.

As the first elected Speaker of the House of Commons, the hon. member from Vancouver felt that it was critical to move immediately to gain the trust and support of his fellow parliamentarians. That he did, and he did it with great flourish, commanding the overwhelming respect of all members of the House in landmark decisions that were seen as fair to all sides.

John Fraser reveres the institution of Parliament and has a profound understanding of the role that it plays in the maintenance of our democratic society and the enrichment of our democratic principles. He more than anyone else in the Chamber has helped to maintain the reputation of the House of Commons as a place for vigorous but dignified discussions of the nation's business. He was always concerned about the dignity and the decorum of the House.

It is also fair to say, and I am sure that this would be supported by all members of the House, that he was fair-minded and always went the extra distance to give every member the benefit of the doubt, sometimes to the exasperation of members on the government side. However his combined abilities, with his wit, his humour and his keen sense of timing, were very important in the discharge of his difficult task as Speaker of the House.

This is the legacy the Speaker of the House of Commons has left to this institution and all Canadians. As parliamentarians and as Canadians we owe him a tremendous debt of gratitude.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Mazankowski: I know all members of the House will want to join with me to pay tribute to John's scrupulous impartiality, the soundness of his judgment and his sense of humour which was often biting but never unfair.

[*Translation*]

John has been consistently sensitive and sympathetic to the cause of linguistic and cultural equality, as reflected in the proceedings of this House.

[*English*]

I will always remember John Fraser as a passionate Canadian, a man who believes in a united, generous and tolerant Canada, who has a zest for life, is a great defender of this institution, enjoys the vigour of debate, and is a man filled with emotion and compassion. These are the principles he believes in and they are the reasons for his unwavering dedication to public life and our way of democracy.

As a Canadian, a fellow parliamentarian and a friend I would simply like to say thanks to the hon. member for Vancouver South. I would like to thank him for setting such a high standard for those who will follow him and thank him for demonstrating to all of us the meaning of the words honour and commitment.

The hon. member for Vancouver South is a true Canadian patriot. This place is richer, better and more effective as a result of his presence and his years of service. Though we all regret that John could not be with us today, we will all join in wishing with him and his

family that he will soon be able to continue putting his remarkable talents at the service of his fellow citizens.

We wish him and his family, his wife Cate and his three daughters, on behalf of all of the members of the government side all the very best in their future endeavours. I join with my other colleagues in the House of Commons in sending John Fraser our sincere best wishes and congratulations and sincere thanks for a job well done.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

Hon. André Ouellet (Papineau—Saint-Michel): Madam Speaker, speaking on behalf of the Official Opposition, it is a great pleasure for me to join the Deputy Prime Minister in paying tribute to our Speaker, Mr. John Fraser.

• (1545)

You will recall that just before the House adjourned for the Easter recess, the hon. member for Vancouver South announced he would not run in the next election. This announcement marked the end of a political career of more than 20 years, during which our hon. friend took part in the proceedings of six Parliaments.

Although this announcement did not necessarily come as a surprise, I must admit that I was sorry to hear it because throughout his career he was a truly exceptional parliamentarian as reflected in the level of his commitment to the Canadian people, his courtesy to all members of this House and especially to me when I was a minister and he was in the opposition. He would take part in the business of parliamentary committees, not with opposition and obstruction uppermost in his mind but with a very open, positive attitude to try and improve bills and make a contribution to the work of Parliament. We are losing a great parliamentarian.

[*English*]

This is a reflection upon both his stout highland ancestry and his resolute Christian upbringing. The character instilled in him early marked him with a vigorous sense of justice and fairness which, fuelled by a not altogether unapparent streak of Scottish stubbornness, add up to the quality that we call the courage of one's convictions.

His commitment to public service first manifested itself in overseas duty with the Canadian army in Germany in the less secure world of the post-war era. On his return to Canada he entered upon a distinguished career in the practice of law which led to his emergence as a true leader of the multicultural community on the lower mainland of British Columbia.

His first attempt to be elected to the House of Commons was a natural outgrowth of his status in the community, but it came in 1968, a year that while propitious for Canada as a whole was not particularly kind to his political party.

I want to briefly remind the House that this is probably one of the last occasions for the Deputy Prime Minister to speak in the House. He is probably the most prestigious member of what we call the class of '68. While I am here to pay tribute to our Speaker I cannot resist the temptation to also salute a great parliamentarian who has had a very distinguished career. We will certainly miss him a lot and I want to wish him well in the future.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Ouellet: I was saying that our friend, the member for Vancouver South, was unable to make it in 1968. However a few others entered Parliament in 1968 who represent the class of '68, a very prestigious class. Some of them will not run again. I particularly want to single out the member for Algoma, the member for York Centre, the member for Edmonton North and the member for Regina—Lumsden. Like the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance they will not be running in the next election, have made substantial contributions to the Canadian Parliament. They have served their constituents well and have been very respectful of this place. I want to pay tribute to all of them on this occasion.

• (1550)

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Ouellet: Fortunately our good friend was able to run four years later and his political fortunes were better then. The great Liberal member of Parliament of the day, Arthur Laing, had been elevated to the other place which probably made things easier for Mr. Fraser.

However to his credit I want to say that he was successfully re-elected in every election in a riding that was considered to be very volatile. It is a tribute to him that his constituents were faithful and loyal in all five successive elections.

[*Translation*]

I want to stress his outstanding contribution to national unity, as reflected in his interventions in Parliament. It clearly demonstrates his tolerance and broad understanding of the cultural and linguistic groups in our country. He always exerted a very healthy influence on strengthening and maintaining Canadian unity. He was also one of the first parliamentarians, as the Deputy Prime Minister mentioned earlier, to take a stand on environmental issues at a time when very few people were discussing these questions. He was, without a doubt, a brilliant proponent of protecting and promoting our natural heritage.

[*English*]

While his political party did not avail itself of the opportunity he gave it to make him its leader, he did serve in two administrations, first as Minister of Environment and later as Minister of Fisheries and Oceans.

It was in this latter position that he came into what must have been the most difficult period of his public service, in any case certainly the most controversial. However even those who were critical of his role understood that what led him into difficulty was in no way related to any wrongdoing or incompetence. On the contrary, it was entirely his desire to protect the most vulnerable of his department's clientele, the low paid and often unemployed workers in the industry.

[*Translation*]

His political opponents, as I said earlier, never interpreted his resignation from cabinet as an admission of guilt. On the contrary, they saw it as an expression of his deep-seated views on parliamentary democracy, a gesture that unfortunately is becoming increasingly rare nowadays. If he had decided to end his political career at that time, we would have remembered him as a man who, despite the duties of his position, had the courage to remain faithful to his principles.

[*English*]

It was for that very reason, principle before office, that his political career did not end there. Before many months his colleagues in the House of Commons were in search of such a person to be their Speaker. After some hesitation, he was persuaded to allow his name to stand. From a field of candidates that included a number of other talented and respected parliamentarians he was chosen by his peers, the first time since new rules were approved by Parliament to elect our Speaker, to preside over their deliberations and be the principal advocate of their democratic rights.

[*Translation*]

The seven years he spent as Speaker of the House of Commons were not among the most tranquil years of his life. Although he did not have to maintain order in a Parliament consisting of unruly minorities, he nevertheless presided over this House during periods that I would describe as particularly intense, with some very difficult debates, including free trade and the constitutional issue.

In fact, the intensity of those debates and the increasing deterioration of the economic fabric of this country have exacerbated national tensions and made for a very charged atmosphere in a House that has never been known as a haven of peace and quiet.

• (1555)

During these years, his patience and impartiality served the House of Commons well.

[*English*]

Like many of his predecessors he has from time to time been called upon to defend the rights and freedoms essential to the maintenance of democratic government. On occasion he has persevered against faceless bureaucracy and the tyranny of his majority. It is no easy task to describe in simple terms the central role of the Speaker of the House of Commons in preserving the delicate balance of a democratic system. History alone can provide judgment on how successful any Speaker has been.

[*Translation*]

When all this is history, and I say this without presuming to dictate the views of historians, I believe John Fraser will be referred to as one of the five best Speakers in the history of the Parliament of Canada.

Although it is unfortunate that illness prevents our Speaker from being here this afternoon—I hope he will be able to watch this debate on television—we are all happy to hear he is convalescing at his mountain cabin, away from the telephone. We hope he will get well soon. We also hope that with his competence and wisdom, he will make a brilliant start on the next stage of his distinguished career.

[*English*]

We do not know what he has planned or even if he has planned anything next, but most of us have no doubt he will find some way to continue to serve his community. We are all certain he has not yet reached that happy age when a man can be idle with impunity.

We wish to thank him for his stellar service and wish him, his wife, his daughters and his entire family nothing but the best in the future. It was John Bunyan who wrote that a democracy was primarily an attitude of mind, a spiritual testament in which politics was the greatest and most honourable adventure. John Fraser's substance and style over more than 20 years have helped make these words ring true today.

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops): Madam Speaker, it is indeed an honour to rise today on behalf of my colleagues in the New Democratic caucus to pay tribute to one of the most outstanding parliamentarians and speakers this country has witnessed. A distinguished colleague and friend to all of us, the hon. John Fraser loved this place.

Sharing a west coast constituency with John Fraser resulted in one of the highlights of my political career and that was spending many hours seated beside John Fraser as one of the two national airlines transported us across the country. One thing one would notice was how people responded to John Fraser. He was a friend to all. It did not matter where we stopped *en route* or who was on board; there was always a steady stream of individuals passing by his seat to greet him, enter into conversations with him and just indicate the respect they held for him as a constituent person, the Speaker of the House and a parliamentarian *per se*.

We acknowledge his contribution over 20-some years to his constituents. The fact that he was returned year after year demonstrated how people felt about the way John Fraser served his constituents. One of the most interesting aspects of the time I have known John Fraser was travelling in Vancouver with him and seeing people from all parts of the city greet and thank him for various services he had provided for them, their families or friends. He was really an outstanding constituent person.

He loved this place. If there is one person who personifies being a parliamentarian it is John Fraser. I often thought that John Fraser looked the way a parliamentarian was supposed to look. Every day he entered the House as Speaker with grace, dignity and commitment. He enjoyed the debating back and forth in the House of Commons. He always said this was not an easy place for people with thin skins or weak hearts. It was a tough place in which to debate, and of course he experienced that on both sides of the House.

• (1600)

What made him special in his position as Speaker were his wit and humour, ability to deflate tense situations and reluctance to ask anyone to leave the Chamber. He would ignore people for long periods of time and not recognize their interest in seeking the floor. In that way over the years he elevated the conduct of members and the way work was done in the House.

I also note how much he has assisted individuals in a personal way. He has an incredible intelligence system that is able to identify when individuals are having difficulty in a committee or having difficulty not getting recognized in Question Period. In many cases he could identify difficulty on a personal level. We could always count on John Fraser sending us notes at the right time or inviting us back to his chambers for a chat, a coffee and cookie or whatever as he discussed our issues of concern.

I also pay tribute to the team that worked with him, not only those who assisted him in his duties as Speaker but his wife, Cate, and his three daughters. On many occasions as the duties of the Speaker required hosting groups and delegations, inviting people over for discussions and so on, his wife, Cate, was always with him. His appreciation of her support and that of his three daughters was really something to behold. He never missed an opportunity to comment on his family. That says a great deal about John Fraser as a person.

We will remember John Fraser as well in the House for the early work he did when he was Minister of the Environment and some of the early initiatives he took in combating acid rain. We remember his behind the scenes work on South Moresby Park. As Speaker he was not able to work up front but we all appreciated the

tremendous effort he made to ensure the park became a reality.

We remember all the work he has done in terms of greening Parliament Hill. All sorts of changes on Parliament Hill reflect his sensitivity toward environmental issues and his appreciation of the outdoors. He certainly is an avid outdoorsman. I remember many occasions when we tried to reach the Speaker we could always find him in rather different places. He would be in some small mountain cabin or some encampment up in the mountains of western Canada pursuing his favourite hobby of fishing.

I know that one of his major disappointments was not being in Kamloops for the grand opening of the world fly-fishing championships. He looked forward to playing a part in that for at least a year, but because of his illness he was unable to be there to welcome his fellow fly-fishers from around the world to Canada and Kamloops to participate in the championships.

I will close because I know there are others who want to pay tribute to John Fraser. I simply want to say that Canada is a better place because of John Fraser. The House is a better place because of John Fraser. He personified all that is great in a parliamentarian. Being the first elected Speaker, he very quickly rose to that occasion and very quickly developed the respect and support of all members of the House.

• (1605)

I want to simply say we wish him well. We wish his wife, Cate, and his three daughters well in the years ahead. We are all friends of John Fraser. We will see much of him in public service. As others have indicated, there was no one who possessed more of a sense of service to the public than John Fraser which he demonstrated throughout his entire life.

I wish him well on behalf of our caucus. May he have many years of excellent fishing ahead.

Hon. Thomas Siddon (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Madam Speaker, on this important day of adjournment I would like to add a few words in honour of our colleague and friend, the Speaker of the House who cannot be with us today.

John Fraser has represented the riding adjacent to mine for 20 years. He has been a true friend to every member of the House but in particular to those of us in the British Columbia caucus. We came to know him closely and have missed him these past few years as he has presided over the whole House. We have been able to continue to share his friendship. In his quiet and helpful way he was always there for us. I know he has been there for all members of the House.

I remember first learning of John Fraser many years ago when I was organizing a conference on the environment at the University of British Columbia. I learned of this rather strange paradox: a Conservative who cared about the environment. I learned about this great man who was the environmental critic for the Conservative Party at that time but who had also led a great crusade against the proposed damming of the Skagit River between southern British Columbia and Washington state.

John's first love was preserving the waters and the natural resources, the fish and wildlife, and enjoying the outdoors as a true sportsman. It is his compassion and dedication to those environmental values which above all else has made the Speaker a great Canadian and one who has made a great contribution to our children and our way of life.

The Speaker, it may not be recalled, was a candidate for the leadership of the Progressive Conservative Party in 1976. I am sure he was glued to his television set last weekend as the great national convention unfolded. I am sure but for his larger duties he wished he could have been there on the convention floor in the heat and excitement of that occasion.

Our Speaker as a British Columbian, a Canadian and a great historian would have been proud from his soul to his mind and throughout his being to see a leader selected as the first woman leader and Prime Minister of Canada from British Columbia.

We all enjoyed those warm and cordial times in Mr. Speaker's office. Other members have other recollections. I remember attending a Christmas dinner with Speaker Fraser in his quarters where he invited his larger family. It was a very unusual experience but one that showed his desire to reach out and bring many friends together with his family.

I remember as a young member of Parliament not being on the aeroplane that the member for Kamloops spoke of, but having the Speaker who was a minister of the Crown at the time carry home my infant daughter and escort my wife to our home in Ottawa because there was no one else there for her but Mr. Fraser. I remember him campaigning for me in my first election and fighting off the hordes that were supporting the Liberal Party. There were not that many left in western Canada but he came to campaign in my riding and ended up suffering from a dog bite because of the way in which he pursued his diligent work on my behalf.

• (1610)

I wanted to say a few words of gratitude because Mr. Speaker cannot be here with us today. We know he has had recent difficulties. To Cate and the family, the daughters, and to John especially, we are very grateful for his fellowship. We wish him good health. This House is poorer today for his absence, but we know that in his heart and soul Mr. Speaker is indeed here with us today and for that we thank him.

Mr. Pat Nowlan (Annapolis Valley—Hants): Madam Speaker, I will be brief. Although I have known John Fraser longer than any other member of the House I almost felt listening to the testimonials that Speaker Fraser could very well have been completely rehabilitated and perhaps grace the chair before the tributes stopped. My tribute will be very short. I have a letter that I wrote to him. I really do appreciate the fact that the Deputy Prime Minister, on this adjournment for the summer recess with the obvious potential for election coming, did raise the tribute to John Fraser.

Just before I read my short letter I want to make a comment to the Deputy Prime Minister who has been an old colleague and a friend of mine. We have unfortunately grown apart in these past couple of years, perhaps with his heavy duties trying to keep the ship of state on course and I in my position trying to sometimes put some reefs in the path of the ship of state.

The interesting thing from the Deputy Prime Minister has been alluded to by the member from Papineau—Saint Michel. I was in the class of 1965 but then there is the class of 1968. The member for Algoma is the one who brought this home in a tribute to him not too long ago in the Commonwealth Room at his 25-year recognition. The public wonders about how members stay around here. I am an exception to a point. I bet this will be news to you, Madam Speaker, that of 96 who came in here in 1968, in view of defeats and announced resignations, there are only 2 who have indicated that they will reoffer. They are the members for Yorkton—Melville and Davenport. In that period 94 of 96 have bitten the dust one way or the other. There are only 2 to come back. In terms of the class of 1968 I think they have added a lot. Certainly the Deputy Prime Minister has added very much.

It is John Fraser whom I say I have known longer than anybody else here. I practised law with him in British Columbia before either of us ever became members of Parliament. I remember him on the Brockton Oval playing English rugby while I had come in from the east to tell the westerners how to play English rugby because that is all we played back there.

I am obviously not going to repeat everything about friendship and I am not going to talk about carrying his daughter home or who carried whom home in some of our relationships. However the fact of the matter is that this is the letter I wrote to Speaker Fraser and I want to read it. It is short. It covers the essence of an awful lot that has been said here today:

> Dear John,
>
> The curtain is about to ring down on this Parliament—and none too soon—and sadly your stewardship comes to a close. Hopefully, you may grace the Chair in a 'brief' summer-September session (if politically correct!) of the new Government, so that Members could pay public tribute to your historic term as our first elected Speaker. But seriously, your health is more important than any public accolades—especially from some 'honourable members' who may have caused some Speaker stress and strain!
>
> So "prenez la garde" and follow the Standing Orders of the Medical Journal and your doctor—for the Hansard record already shows that you graced the Chair with dignity, diligence and the special delights of subtle Scottish humour. Your calm in the jungle of partisan procedural harangue defined new dimensions of common sense and diplomacy—the tender ego of parliamentary warriors was rarely bruised, just directed down the Byzantine byways of Beauchesne to the pastures of parliamentary peace!
>
> Thanks for a job welldone—and all the best to you and Cate.

• (1615)

I am glad to have this opportunity to pay tribute to a friend, a great parliamentarian and our first elected Speaker. It was an honour to serve under him.

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona): Madam Speaker, I hope that Mr. Speaker, wherever he is, perhaps at home recovering from his recent difficulties, is watching today. I hope, Madam Speaker, you will forgive me if sometimes I say Mr. Speaker because I will actually be referring to Mr. Speaker whom I hope is watching and not to the Chair.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Allow me to interrupt the hon. member for a minute. It may answer his question. I was told a little while ago that our Speaker was told about today's tributes to him. I think you will recognize this because I could not have made this up. In answer he said: "I am very intrigued but also quite terrified. I do not have any control over this".

Mr. Blaikie: Madam Speaker, as people rose and as we saw more than one tribute being paid today to the outgoing Prime Minister and now to the Speaker and the class of 1968 and who knows who will be next, I was reminded of a story that Tommy Douglas used to tell after he was given particularly glowing introductions. He used to tell the story of the widow who was sitting at her husband's funeral with her young daughter. In the middle of the eulogy she instructed her young daughter to run up to the front and have a look in the casket to see if it actually was her father lying there.

I was reminded of that story because it often seems that we do say an awful lot of good things about each other after spending many years saying an awful lot of bad things about each other in this place.

I think the career of Mr. Speaker is a good example of that because we all remember the great trouble that he fell into. It has not been mentioned today, but I will mention it because it points to something good about this place. As a result of the famous tuna scandal he had to resign his ministry at that time. I think it was an expression of the sense of the whole House that sometimes politics is very unfair to individuals who are caught in circumstances that are not entirely of their own making.

It was the sense of the whole House that this sometimes happened. When that happened to the member for Vancouver South and we had the opportunity as the House to rehabilitate him, so to speak, by electing him our Speaker in what was an unexpected election at that time in 1986, we did so. He became the first elected Speaker of the House. It took 11 hours of balloting. I think he exercised that new role well.

I have sometimes felt, and I have said this to him personally, that he had more authority than he sometimes chose to use because he was the first elected Speaker of the House. However, I know that in his own mind he always felt he was operating within what he saw as the appropriate limits of the authority which the House had given him.

I think it is appropriate that we pay tribute to him today. We are all sorry that he cannot be here but:

> The best-laid schemes o' mice an' men *Gang aft agley*.

Robert Burns also said:

> O wad some power the giftie gie us, To see oursels' as ithers see us!

On occasions like this Mr. Speaker and others have had a chance to see themselves as others have seen them over the years and I think that is only appropriate at the end of a long and distinguished political career.

Hon. Walter McLean (Waterloo): Madam Speaker, I want to join with the Deputy Prime Minister and others who have paid tribute to Speaker John Fraser. It may be appropriate for a McLean and a Fraser to have a moment of anecdotal history.

I belong with John Fraser to the failed class of 1968. This was not often used in North America but John came and helped me write my first political speech in the riding of Victoria. Whether it was the one he used in Vancouver shortly thereafter, he at least won the nomination. I did not win the nomination. However he introduced me to public life. Coming back from years of living in Africa, he encouraged me to come and bring some international concerns into the political forum and into the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada.

• (1620)

I think back to his international interests and his concerns. Much has been made of his environmental

concerns and we know of his leadership there. I remember him coming to the House in the early 1980s at the time of the nuclear threat. I found that one of his environmental interests was tightly knit to his concerns for nuclear war and nuclear weaponry. We collaborated in trying to keep that issue alive with many of the NGOs.

I think the member from Fort Garry has touched on his love of verse. In my family home in Victoria over the hearth are the words: "Lang mai yur lum reck". I think we are echoing to John: "Long may your chimney smoke".

We heard him at his best at the prayer breakfast as he talked about wisdom and living and many of us wish we had half a measure of that wisdom. We wish him health and to be speedily returned to be among us.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Madam Speaker,I would like to say a few words, and I will be very brief. If there is anyone in this House who knew John Fraser in times that were occasionally very difficult, it was certainly the member for Ottawa—Vanier. You will recall that I was the Liberal Party Whip for a caucus that consisted of 40 members when there were 211 or 212 government members. It was not easy to consider the rights and privileges of members when faced with situations that were sometimes difficult, both for the Speaker and for members.

During my seven years as party Whip, I had to deal with the Speaker of the House, Mr. Fraser. We were friends before, but we became good friends during those few years between October 1, 1986 and today. I want to tell hon. members that the reason I appreciated Mr. Fraser may have been because I have Scots blood. My mother was a Leslie and my Gauthier side seemed to appeal to the Scot in Fraser.

He had a sense of humour and a sense of duty. He also was quick to recognize a situation where one might need his help and advice. I want to thank him most sincerely for all the help he has given the members of this House, especially opposition members, because he was there to protect us, and I say this also to you, Madam Speaker, and to all those who were part of his staff. I want to say thank you very much on behalf of the members for whom I was for some time the embodiment of party discipline. Whips being what they are, they sometimes have a difficult job to do. However, I simply want to say to John Fraser: John, thank you very much! John Fraser is a good man.

[*English*]

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Madam Speaker, I know that my friend will be able to speak in a moment. I am pleased to be able to rise from the dentist's chair where a few moments ago I had a tooth jerked out. I would not have missed the opportunity to say something even it is just through the Chamber and a television camera to John and Cate.

The Speaker is not only a very good friend of all of us in here; he is a very good friend of all Canadians of any political persuasion.

I recall in particular two instances that I would like to remind the House of that demonstrated the vision the Speaker demonstrated from the chair which drew hundreds of thousands if not millions of Canadians back into a feeling that this place has a heart and can in fact act in the best interests of everyone at once.

On a day almost six years ago a motion came to the floor of this House about Gwaii Haanas which is known to many of us as South Moresby. Although it was a private member's motion in my name, my friend from Winnipeg Birds Hill being almost as crafty as the Speaker himself figured a way of rewording it so that it could in fact be adopted by the House unanimously.

• (1625)

It was put by the Speaker and it was adopted, as I am sure many members on the government side recall. It was a miracle that it was passed. As Miles Richardson, president of the Haida Nation said, perhaps for a brief moment that day the spirit of the aboriginal peoples of this continent hovered over the Chamber as the miracle of that motion passed to protect the area of Haida Gwaii in perpetuity.

It was also a bit of a miracle in that the motion that passed was unconstitutional. No private member can present a motion that ultimately would cost the government over $100 million, but it did on that day and great fruit has been borne of it.

Another motion passed more recently that I am sure John in particular remembers well was the one that flowed from the Brundtland commission. It was put in the House in good faith last year by myself and was subsequently amended by the present Minister of the Environment who narrowly missed becoming prime

minister three days ago. Along with the co-operation of the member for LaSalle—Émard, the three parties came together and with the assistance of the Speaker put a motion to set aside 12 per cent of Canada in co-operation with the provinces and territories in perpetuity. That in good faith is now under way.

Without the inspiring involvement of the Speaker, such a momentous activity could not have been accomplished. In fact the first legislature on the planet to pass a 12 per cent resolution was this Parliament with the help of the Speaker.

There is one thing the Chamber might want to do, and I leave this in your hands and all of our hands. A wonderful photograph of Winston Churchill hangs in the Speaker's office that many of us have looked at many times as we have sat talking about privilege or about this or that, particularly environmental matters. It has occurred to me on occasion that a piece of the Speaker is very much like Winston Churchill. We should honour the Speaker by making sure that particular photograph is transmitted on behalf of all of us to him, perhaps to hang at Whistler where I think he sits today.

Just as the Speaker felt a very special emotion when he saw the movie *A River Runs Through It*, I close my remarks by reminding John and Cate as they watch that there is a river of friendship that runs through this place to him. We thank God and we thank the great spirit that his health is good and will be for a long time. We wish him and Cate and their family good health from all of us in this place.

Mr. Stan Darling (Parry Sound—Muskoka): Madam Speaker, everything has pretty well been said, but I felt I wanted to rise to pay tribute to our Speaker.

The Hon. John Fraser and I are of the class of 1972. When we were first elected I believe there were about 55 PCs, which was a great influx in those days. Of the class of '72 I see a couple here. Only 11 are left, and of that 11 only three have said they are not retiring. In my particular case, I probably will be leaving this Chamber after 21 wonderful years.

I can think back on many of the great things that our colleague, John Fraser, did. I was involved from 1981 on in representations against acid rain and Speaker Fraser of course, as has been stated time and again, was and is one of the great environmentalists. We went cap in hand to Washington on occasion, not too successfully.

Be that as it may, an acid rain treaty was finally signed in March 1991, and I know the Speaker had a great deal to do with that. I certainly wish him all the best in his retirement.

We were in his chambers a few weeks ago. He had a reception there and he said: "You know, Stan, I am 61 now and you were 61 when you were first elected to the House of Commons which is rather a coincidence".

• (1630)

He was one of the great Speakers, with all due deference to you, Madam Speaker. I wish John, Cate and the family all the best in the future. This House of Commons, or as it is sometimes know, the Common House, will certainly be the loser when he is no longer here.

Mr. David Barrett (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to say a few words to a fellow Scot.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Barrett: John Fraser has already been eulogized but I want to assure everybody who is still watching this particular part of Parliament that the Speaker is very much alive and is doing very well in spite of the things that have been said about him here today.

I want to talk a bit about the rugby experience shared by my friend the member for Annapolis Valley—Hants. I too not privileged to be on the same side as the Speaker, and I want it to go on the record that he was the dirtiest player that ever played on the rugby field. I want that understood.

He was tough, he was hard, but there was a part of him that was especially important for British Columbians and for Canadians. The constituency that he represents is a microcosm of all races, creeds, cultures, and religions of people living in the province of British Columbia.

Like other parts of the country we have had problems regarding racism. His election and his service to every single person who asked for it in that constituency was a paragon of virtue in terms of interpreting what the role of elected members should be. There is not a single place in the city of Vancouver that John Fraser can walk

into where he is not instantly recognized and immediately appreciated.

There is not a single member of any religious group in his riding—he has the largest Sikh temple in the province of British Columbia—where he is not appreciated for his commitment to the citizens of this country by manifesting service to the citizens of his constituency.

Would that all of us were able to emulate his graciousness, his openness and understanding of the differences that make us Canadians from coast to coast, we would have half the problems that we have now.

I am honoured to have served with him. I am honoured to have been his opponent. I hope that the many future years he still has in his life will be as enjoyable as he deserves right up to this point as well.

Mr. Len Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke): Madam Speaker, thank you for giving me a few minutes to say a word about our illustrious Speaker, John Fraser. He has been a long-time friend. As the hon. member for Parry Sound—Muskoka mentioned, he came in with quite a large number of MPs in 1972 and when he entered this place he was destined for great things in the House of Commons.

He has been loved and respected by members on both sides of the Chamber. I think it can be said that he is respected and admired by Canadian people who have watched him over the years. They saw in him a large element of fairness, a large element of promoting good decorum in the House of Commons. Nothing was more effective in the Chamber when there was a bit of a ruckus going on and members went on for some time without settling down and being quiet for him to stand and say "the Canadian people are watching you". It did not take the House very long to come to order.

He was elected by members from all parties in the House of Commons and he was respected by all of them.

The reason he was such a successful Speaker and so well liked was that he had long experience on both sides of this Chamber. He sat in opposition for some time and he sat in government.

• (1635)

He had a real feel for what members were thinking out here on the floor. He could read the opinions and feelings of MPs and he would act accordingly. That is very essential for someone who occupies the chair in this House. As a result of the fact that he had that feeling he knew how to handle difficult situations with a sense of decency and in a way by which he gained the respect of members of the House.

He is a great environmentalist, as many people have mentioned today, and he always will be. He also has a very in-depth understanding of the military community of Canada. He has a great respect for militia units across the country. He has always held them in very high regard.

He had a real feel for Parliament, not only for the MPs and others but for his staff. He treated his staff with decency. He always made sure they were recognized for the good and diligent work they did in this place and on the Hill in general. As a result he earned their respect in return.

Another great quality he had was that in spite of his busy schedule he always had time to set aside a few minutes for someone who wanted to talk to him about a problem or bring an issue to his attention.

He is a great admirer of Winston Churchill, as has been mentioned on the floor of the House today. He also has a love of history. He has a great knowledge of Canadian history and Commonwealth history. That gave him another perspective that was needed in this place. He knew the traditions of Parliament going back for centuries.

In late 1978 I had the distinct pleasure of going to the Middle East, particularly Israel, with him. While we were there we had many meetings. We were in Egypt's parliament and we met the cabinet and the Prime Minister of the day. He was right at home in that element, even at that time long before he had exercised a position of real power in the House.

I want to say to John Fraser as he watches this eulogy in the House of Commons today, no doubt with his wife Cate and his family, that we wish him a speedy recovery. As one who has had a very successful recovery I wish him every success in the days ahead. We hope he will go on to

offer his services to his home community, to his province and to his country for many years to come. He is certainly going to be missed in this place but John Fraser, the first elected Speaker of the House of Commons of Canada, will never be forgotten by any of us.

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Madam Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House today to the fact that a week from tomorrow, on June 25, will be the 25th anniversary of the election of 1968 when some 96 members of Parliament were first elected.

This was a very historic election. Some 64 Liberals, 16 Progressive Conservatives, 9 New Democrats and 7 Creditistes were first elected. There are members who are still in the House who were among that group of 96 members of Parliament first elected in 1968, including the Deputy Prime Minister. That group also included the former Leader of the NDP, Mr. Broadbent, the former leader of the Ralliement Creditiste, Mr. André Fortin, who was unfortunately killed in a very sad and tragic accident, the former Speaker of the House, Mr. Jerome, the former Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario, Lincoln Alexander, many judges, four or five senators and a number of provincial party leaders.

• (1640)

There are only six members left in the House today. The member for Vegreville who is the Deputy Prime Minister, the Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole, the hon. members for Yorkton—Melville, Regina—Lumsden, York Centre, Davenport and me. After this Parliament, as was mentioned earlier this afternoon, only two members will be running again in the next election. They are the hon. member for Yorkton—Melville and the hon. member for Davenport. We congratulate them on their tenacity, stamina and political longevity.

I might mention in passing that the Speaker of the House, Mr. Fraser, ran in 1968. Unfortunately he was not elected at that time but he has often extended great hospitality to the class of '68. There was the annual dinner and reception, sponsored by the Speaker and his wife, Cate. I want to extend my good wishes to them today as tributes are being paid.

We also often adopted the hon. member for Papineau—Saint-Michel. He was not exactly in the class of '68 as he was actually elected in a by-election in November 1967. However he has always hung around with the gang. Our theme song this afternoon might be *They're Breaking up that Old Gang of Mine* because after this election there will probably be only two in the House.

As we look back on that election in 1968, we were just coming off the centennial celebration. Clearly the country was in a mood of great confidence and great determination. There was a certain *esprit de corps* which we did not really have last year. I hope the country will regain that *esprit de corps* when the new Parliament, the 35th Parliament of Canada, is gathered together this fall or early next winter. Even though we have many problems in this country, with that kind of spirit, confidence and enthusiasm I think we can overcome those problems.

To my colleagues who were elected in 1968 and other friends throughout the House I extend my very good wishes. Being here these last 25 years has been one of the most exciting, challenging, stimulating and rewarding experiences of my life. I am sure that is true for every other member, especially those who are retiring with this Parliament.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Before we continue I would like the House to allow me to say a few words about our dear friend and Speaker, John Fraser. I would especially like to say two words, and they are: Thank you.

I first knew John Fraser in cabinet in 1984. I have been one of his deputies since 1986.

[*Translation*]

John Fraser was first and foremost a great Canadian. With his loyalty and fairness, his sense of duty, his sense of humour and patience, he has set a very high standard for his successors in the years to come. As a parliamentarian and an environmentalist, he has always shown tremendous dedication, generosity, understanding and warmth.

[*English*]

It has been an honour to know you. Sébastien and I will always feel privileged to be counted among your friends. To you, to Cate and to the family, we wish you all the good times you so dearly earned and so richly deserved. Godspeed.

Hon. colleagues, I would feel remiss if I did not follow the tradition today and in our Speaker's name invite you all to his chamber for the usual goodbye.

• (1645)

[*Translation*]

As of now—and I would have said this earlier, but I didn't really have a chance to interrupt this very moving and appropriate tribute to our Speaker—members are invited to partake of some refreshments in the Speaker's chambers.

* * *

[*English*]

CLASS OF '68

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance): Madam Speaker, I am sorry to prolong the tributes, but as a member of the class of '68 I wanted to join with the member for Algoma and my good friend from Papineau—Saint-Michel to pay tribute to the distinguished class of 1968, those who survived and those who went on to do other things.

In looking over the occupations of the 96 members who came to the House of Commons on June 25, 1968 we can see that they covered a wide cross-section of Canadian society. There were railroaders—and I mean real true railroaders—union leaders, mayors, businessmen, farmers, fishermen, lawyers, professors, doctors, stock brokers, administrators, the odd automobile dealer and people from the professions. They really brought quite a broad perspective of views and opinions with them to the House of Commons and obviously brought their views and concerns which reflected the regions from which they came.

There were a number of firsts that were achieved by the class of '68. Three stand out in my mind. Lincoln Alexander, who later went on to become the Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Ontario, was the first black person elected to the Parliament of Canada. That was really quite a thrill, certainly for him and particularly for us because he was a member of our party.

Len Marchand, who is now firmly entrenched in the other place and has been a great member of Parliament, a great public servant and now a tremendous senator, was the first Indian to ever be elected to the House of Commons.

The hon. member for Yorkton—Melville, and I have to say this because he would be too modest to say it in his remarks, at the time he was elected was the youngest member to have ever entered the House of Commons. I think he had to quit school and come down here to take on the job.

There was a lot of attention with respect to the variety of members who came here in 1968, but there was clearly a lot of focus on these three members.

I had a chance to go through a number of the people who comprised the class of '68. It is really interesting and noteworthy to consider where they are and what they are doing today. I have already mentioned Lincoln Alexander, who went on to become the Lieutenant-Governor. The member for Oshawa, the Hon. Ed Broadbent, went on to become the leader of the New Democratic Party.

We had people like Judd Buchanan, who is pursuing a distinguished business career; Walter Carter from Newfoundland, who is now in the Newfoundland legislature; Louis Comeau, who I believe is the CEO for Nova Scotia Power; Eymard Corbin, who is in the Senate; Bud Cullen, who went on to become a minister and is in the Federal Court today; Pierre de Bane, who went on to become a minister and a member of the Senate; Alastair Gillespie, who went on to become a minister; Phil Givens, who is the former mayor of Toronto and is a very colourful individual who never really got used to this place and went back to Toronto; our good friend Joe Guay, who was a great parliamentarian and a great committee member and went on to become a minister and a member of the Senate; and there was Speaker Jerome, a very distinguished member of the class of '68 who was a very distinguished Speaker of the House and then went on to become and is presently the Associate Chief Justice of the Federal Court.

• (1650)

Otto Lang who was dean of law at the University of Saskatchewan had a very distinguished career here. John Lundrigan was a very colourful member of the class of '68. He went on to become a member of the Newfoundland government. There were people like Mark MacGuigan and Patrick Mahoney who are now in the Federal Court. I could go on. Keith Penner is now with the National Transportation Agency. Frank Moores went on to become the premier of Newfoundland. Mark Rose.

I know my hon. friend across the way gets a little annoyed about reminiscing, but one of these days he will have a chance to reflect on 25 years of service.

What we have here is a pretty good cross-section of what the House of Commons really represents. Yes, there are some who have passed on and we think of them. We think of their families. We remember our friendship and the association we had together in this place.

As others have said in their remarks, I think what we really want to say is that these members contributed greatly to the institution of Parliament. We value the friendship that was made during the course of our association with them.

We all recognize that we believe in the profession of politics. We believe in this institution. This really is the main hall of the preservation of our democracy and our freedom. All of us can be enriched by the valuable contribution the class of '68 rendered to this institution and indeed to the House.

I want to add my congratulations to those who are here, those who have survived and those who have contributed not only to this institution but in their other walks of life in pursuing the goals and objectives of building a better Canada.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina—Lumsden): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join my colleagues from Algoma and Vegreville and others in reminiscing. I have been thinking not only about those still here from the class of '68 but also those that no longer are here.

What made me think about it is that in the spring of 1969 members of the Press Club challenged the House of Commons to a softball game. What they did not know was there were many good country ball players in the class of '68.

Gerry Cobbe, a Liberal member from Portage who is now deceased, played first base. Jack Horner was catcher but he was not in the '68 class. Rocha LaSalle was an excellent glove man and shortstop. I played second base. John Skoberg from Moose Jaw, another railroader and former colleague, played centre field and galloped around catching flies. My colleague from Yorkton—Melville was pitching. In fact he had a no-hitter going for six innings.

The Speaker of the day, Hon. Lucien Lamoureux, was a great baseball fan. He set up a temporary backstop on the front lawn of the Parliament buildings. He always showed up at the games. He stood behind the backstop rooting for the MPs. I want to tell this story of how I got an extra question in Question Period.

I made a circus catch on a foul ball. I was playing second base and I caught it out behind first base. Of course I went ass over tea kettle in the course of doing that but when I got back to the bench Mr. Lamoureux came around and said: "*Mon collègue*, for that catch you get an extra question in Question Period".

• (1655)

That was in June. In late September or October I was selected by my caucus to ask the lead-off question. It concerned box cars, grain movement and so forth. I put my first question and the two supplementaries we are allowed. Then Real Caouette of the Ralliement Créditiste who was sitting over here rose to his feet to ask questions as the lead-off questioner for his party.

I leaped to my feet saying: "Mr. Speaker, point of order". In those days one could interrupt anything with a point of order, even Question Period. I think the rules were better then. I said: "You will recall, Sir, an event that occurred last June and I have a further supplementary question". He smiled and said: "The hon. member for Regina—Lake Centre on a further supplementary question". That is how I got four questions in.

Tommy Douglas and Stanley Knowles in particular went nuts trying to figure how the heck I pulled that off until I told them it was on account of a foul ball.

The hon. member for Vegreville, a dear friend and colleague, has mentioned a number of people who used to be here. He was interrupted when he mentioned our good buddy Mark Rose. Mark is now the agent general for British Columbia in London, England.

All of the members who were here at that time have gone on to better and greater things. I think a lot of that was because of the schooling they received in this place.

Sir, it has been an honour and a privilege to serve the people in our constituencies, to serve our country and to battle royal here in a partisan way, democratically. Yet, Sir, you will have noticed it takes a heck of a lot longer, twice as long, when we are being nice to each other than it does when we are fighting over something but that is

okay. We do not do this very often, maybe once every four or five years.

In any event it was a wonderful afternoon. All of us appreciate it. Those of us who were picked out and marked on this occasion appreciate it all the more.

I also want to add my personal tributes to the hon. John Fraser, another dear friend and I hope he will be a fellow goose hunter.

Hon. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton—Melville): Mr. Speaker, as the only member of the class of '68 who has not spoken this afternoon, I just want to say a couple of words. It has been quite the experience serving 25 years in this place. One does not believe how quickly time goes.

I remember that when I was first elected I had only been to Ottawa once. I had hitch-hiked through here in blue jeans and sandals in the summer of 1967. I stopped at the Centennial Flame and took a picture of the place, never expecting that I would be back a year later.

As someone who had just turned 22 during the campaign, it was quite the experience to walk into this place and see the likes of Pierre Trudeau. In those days he was like a rock star when he travelled this country. Down in this corner there was John Diefenbaker who was a monumental figure in the House of Commons. There were Tommy Douglas, Stanley Knowles and David Lewis in my party. Indeed there was Real Caouette who sat where the hon. member for Nickel Belt sits today. Those were really very historic figures. It was really quite a time to be elected to the House of Commons.

One also wonders about the casualty rate in this business. As a friend of mine said, 96 of us were elected. Only six of us are here now and only two of us are planning on seeking re-election. It does make one wonder about the casualty rate.

Before I sit down and in case this Parliament does not come back, I would like to pay a special tribute to my colleague from Regina—Lumsden. We were both elected in 1968. We call him very fondly by the name of Benji or Boxcar Benjamin. He has meant a lot to our party. He has meant a lot to me personally. We have been friends for a long, long time.

• (1700)

As a 19-year old kid, back around 1965 I very shyly—and I am still a shy country boy—walked into his office one day and introduced myself to him. He was the provincial secretary of the party, the CCF in those days. He is one of the people who got me involved in politics. He got a number of others involved in politics in those days as well.

On behalf of my party I want to say to you Les, my good friend, that we are going to miss you when this Parliament returns. I am sure my friend from Regina East feels the same way. We also say thank you for your service. We thank Connie for her support and service of us and the party. We honour her here today as well.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nystrom: I would say in closing that Les Benjamin is one of those people who even when things are tough never gives up the fight. He has a good sense of humour and brings some levity to this place. He makes politics a real joy.

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops): Mr. Speaker, I want to echo my colleague's comments regarding Les Benjamin. I want to thank Les for all the years and the tremendous amount of sage advice he offered regularly not only personally to our caucus but to Parliament and the country in general.

I also want to pay tribute to a colleague in the other House who has represented Kamloops for many years. First elected in 1968, Senator Len Marchand was the first Indian member of Parliament to be elected to the House of Commons. Mr. Marchand represented his constituents extremely well. As a member of Parliament he made the people of Kamloops very proud to be represented by him.

Senator Marchand is admired and respected by all who know him. He is supported by a caring and loving family. I also want to recognize of course his contribution not just to his constituents but to the residents of British Columbia generally and to Canada for the excellent work he has also done in the Senate of Canada.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

CANADA'S EXPORT OF MILITARY MATERIAL

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT

Mr. Charles A. Langlois (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and to Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the third annual report on Canada's export of military material. This report covers the year 1992.

* * *

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Charles A. Langlois (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and to Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 49 petitions.

[*Editor's Note: See today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

Mr. Gagliano: Mr. Speaker, through you, I would like to ask for unanimous consent to go to petitions before going to motions. Since this may be the last sitting day before the summer, it would give hon. members who have petitions a chance to present them.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Does the House agree?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

PETITIONS

EDUCATION

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition signed by many constituents in Ottawa—Vanier.

[*English*]

The petitioners are concerned with the standards of education in Canada. They humbly pray and call upon Parliament in co-operation with the provinces to establish Canada-wide standardized testing for students.

These people have tabled several petitions. I believe the objective is to improve the education of our children and I support the petition.

* * *

SERIAL KILLER CARDS

Mr. Bill Kempling (Burlington): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour under Standing Order 36 to present 27 petitions duly certified and containing 26,966 signatures of citizens from Burlington, Hamilton, Ancaster, Dundas, Stoney Creek, and several other towns and cities in Canada.

The petitioners support Mrs. Debbie Mahaffy in her efforts to have killer cards stopped from being imported into Canada. We applaud the efforts of the Minister of National Revenue for his statement in support of this action.

The petitioners request that Parliament amend the law to prohibit the importation, distribution and sale and manufacture of killer cards.

• (1705)

NORTH AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to present quite a stack of petitions, literally thousands of names from communities throughout all of western Canada including some of central Canada who are very concerned about the North America free trade agreement and its clauses that make the interbasin transfer of water possible in order to sell water into Mexico and the United States. They oppose this strongly and are asking the Canadian government to seek a negotiated exclusion for Canadian rivers and lakes to ensure that our water will not be sold to the United States or Mexico.

YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops): The second petition calls for a review of the Young Offenders Act. These petitioners point out a whole range of concerns which they have, again reflecting the signatures of hundreds of people all from the constituency of Kamloops who want the Young Offenders Act to be revisited and changed to more adequately reflect the original intent of the legislation.

NATIONAL SOLIDARITY DAY

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops): I have another petition, Mr. Speaker, that calls upon Parliament to enact Bill C-268 which is an act respecting a national solidarity day for the aboriginal people of Canada.

VIA RAIL

I have another petition here, Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Riis: I have been asked to present petitions. Mr. Speaker. I think we could find ample time to allow people to present petitions. If my hon. friend is asking me not to present petitions on behalf of my constituents I will tell him to forget it, that is my job.

Mr. Benjamin: Don't pay any attention to them, Nelson.

Mr. Riis: Again, this petition calls upon the House of Commons to restore VIA Rail service, particularly where it was eliminated along the north shore of Lake Superior.

INCOME TAX ACT

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops): Lastly, Mr. Speaker, a petitioner asks that I present this petition calling upon Parliament to amend the Income Tax Act of Canada to exclude child support payments from the taxable income of custodial parents.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Order, please. I will have to suspend presentation of petitions, and I apologize. According to the motion that was adopted, the House was to proceed to petitions before motions. I would like to dispose of the other items, since members with reports to present were expecting to be called immediately. As a courtesy and out of respect for the traditions of this House, I would prefer to dispose of the other items on the orders of the day.

* * *

[*English*]

INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATION

REPORT OF INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

Mr. Bruce Halliday (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34(1) I have the honour to present to the House, in both official languages, the report of the Canadian group of the Interparliamentary Union which represented Canada at the Interparliamentary Symposium on Parliament, Guardian of Human Rights, which was held in Budapest, Hungary May 19 to 22, 1993.

* * *

PARLIAMENTARY DELEGATION

REPORT ON TRIP TO VENEZUELA AND COLOMBIA

Mr. Bob Porter (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34 I have the honour to present to the House, in both official languages, the report of the delegation from the Canadian Parliament which travelled to Venezuela and Colombia from May 9 to 18, 1993.

* * *

[*Translation*]

MULTICULTURALISM AND CITIZENSHIP

SECOND REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Jean-Pierre Hogue (Outremont): Mr. Speaker, through you I want to wish the Speaker of the House a speedy convalescence.

Today, I have the honour to present the second report of the Standing Committee on Multiculturalism and Citizenship. The report, *Study of the implementation of the Canadian Multiculturalism Act in federal institutions*, is the result of about two years of work, during which committee members painstakingly examined how federal institutions are adjusting to the ethno-cultural and racial diversity of this country.

• (1710)

The committee noted that most central institutions of the federal government are now aware, not only of the close relationship between multiculturalism and our Canadian democratic principles, but also of the psychological, socio-cultural, economic and political benefits of a harmonious integration of members of ethno-cultural minorities within our great Canadian nation.

While stressing the progress made by federal institutions by implementing the Canadian Multiculturalism Act, the committee has also raised fundamental questions about managing the ethno-cultural diversity of this country and maximizing the benefits of that diversity.

The Standing Committee on Multiculturalism and Citizenship requests the government's response to this report, pursuant to Standing Order 109.

* * *

[*English*]

HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE STATUS OF DISABLED PERSONS

SIXTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Bruce Halliday (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I have reports from two standing committees to table if I may.

First I have the honour to present in the usual format as well as in the alternate formats of Braille, computer disc, large print and an audio cassette the sixth report of the Standing Committee on Human Rights and the Status of Disabled Persons entitled *Getting Back on the Road, Passenger Transportation and Persons With Disabilities*.

In accordance with its unique mandate under Standing Order 108(3)(b), the committee has examined the question of transportation for disabled persons, including consideration of specific sections relating to disabled persons of the report from the National Transportation Act Review Commission entitled *Competition in Transportation Policy and Legislation in Review*. This report was presented to the House by the Minister of Transport on March 9, 1993.

In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 109, the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to this report.

In keeping with the subject matter of this report from the standing committee and recognizing the tributes that were paid today to Speaker Fraser, I would like to recognize the fact that while he was indeed very committed to issues of environment and the military, his Scottish heritage and other matters, we should not forget that he had a very long-standing interest in the subject area of disability. He and his staff on the Hill have gone a long way to make Parliament Hill much more accessible than heretofore. We want to extend that congratulations to him.

HEALTH AND WELFARE, SOCIAL AFFAIRS

NINTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Bruce Halliday (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the chair of the Standing Committee on Health and Welfare, Social Affairs, Seniors and the Status of Women, I have the honour to table in both official languages the ninth report of that committee entitled *Disclosure of Information to Emergency Response Personnel*.

The committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to the report within 150 days.

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

This is not to quarrel with the committee report that the hon. member had just introduced, but the representative from the New Democratic Party on that committee submitted a minority report. This minority report is not a quarrel with the committee report but simply encourages legislative action to be taken.

Since we are trying to move this quickly today I wonder if I could seek unanimous consent of the House to simply have this minority report appended to the original report.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

BILL C-301

REPORT OF LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

Mr. Rex Crawford (Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the report of the Legislative Committee on Bill C-301, an act to amend the Financial Administration Act (financial information) without amendment.

[*Editor's Note: See today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

• (1715)

BROADCASTING ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

Mr. David Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) moved for leave to introduce Bill C–458, an act to amend the Broadcasting Act and the Radiocommunication Act.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Pursuant to Standing Order 68(2), the motion is deemed adopted.

Mr. Kilgour: Mr. Speaker, very briefly, this is a bill that would amend the Broadcasting Act and Radiocommunication Act and ensure that they not infringe on the basic rights of Canadians to communicate in a free and democratic society.

The law as it stands now leaves, in my view, too much room for different interpretation and imposes too many restrictions. For example, it states that applicants wishing to broadcast religious programming as part of basic cable service must offer diverse points of view on the issues of public concern. It also states that they can be exempt from this if offering their services to those willing to pay for it on cable.

In a sentence, it would appear to be unfair and unrealistic to impose on religious broadcasters an obligation to also present different points of view. Nor does it seem fair in my view in an open society to deny a licence to religious programmers producing mainly in another country.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Mr. Kilgour moves that the bill be now read the first time and printed.

Pursuant to Standing Order 69(1), the motion is deemed adopted.

Bill read the first time and printed.

* * *

[*English*]

PIONEER MONUMENT ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

Mr. John R. Rodriguez (Nickel Belt) moved for leave to introduce Bill C–459, an act to honour the immigrants and pioneers who have come to Canada from the four corners of the world by placing a monument on Parliament Hill to recognize their contribution to Canadian society.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Pursuant to Standing Order 68(2), the motion is deemed adopted.

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, on the Hill we have monuments which recognize individual contributions of Canadians. My proposal is to recognize the collective contributions made by immigrants who have come to Canada from all corners of the world as well as by the pioneers who helped to build the country that we know today as Canada.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Mr. Rodriguez moves that the bill be now read the first time and printed.

Pursuant to Standing Order 69(1), the motion is deemed adopted.

Bill read the first time and printed.

* * *

[*English*]

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION ACT, 1987

MEASURE TO AMEND

Mr. Scott Thorkelson (Edmonton—Strathcona) moved for leave to introduce Bill C–460, an act to amend the National Transportation Act, 1987.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Pursuant to Standing Order 68(2), the motion is deemed adopted.

Mr. Thorkelson: Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House to introduce a private members' bill. This bill is an act to amend the National Transportation Act, 1987. The purpose of this bill is to alter the definition of Canadian as it applies to air carriers in the National Transportation Act. This bill proposes to change the required percentage of voting interests owned and controlled by Canadians from 75 per cent to 51 per cent. The purpose of this amendment is to allow more foreign investment in Canadian air carriers in order to maintain competition within Canada.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Mr. Thorkelson moves that the bill be now read the first time and printed.

Pursuant to Standing Order 69(1), the motion is deemed adopted.

Bill read the first time and printed.

* * *

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURE TO AMEND

Mr. Scott Thorkelson (Edmonton—Strathcona) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-461, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Corrections and Conditional Release Act.

• (1720)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Pursuant to Standing Order 68(2), the motion is deemed adopted.

Mr. Thorkelson: Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce a bill to amend the Criminal Code and the Corrections and Conditional Release Act. The purpose of this bill is to give the courts the power to cancel or change a prohibition order related to vehicle licences that have been revoked for more than five years and to take this power away from the National Parole Board.

This will ensure that any cancellation or change will take place in a public setting in order to facilitate public discussion and debate.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Mr. Thorkelson moves that the bill be now read the first time and printed.

Pursuant to Standing Order 69(1), the motion is deemed adopted.

Bill read the first time and printed.

* * *

NATIONAL NEIGHBOURHOOD ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

Hon. Bob Layton (Lachine—Lac-Saint-Louis) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-462, an act respecting national neighbourhood day.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Pursuant to Standing Order 68(2), the motion is deemed adopted.

Mr. Layton: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce a private member's bill respecting national neighbourhood day.

Constituent Daniel Latour of Pointe Claire, Quebec, first came to my office last year looking for recognition of this worthwhile day. This year we collaborated in several promotional ventures with other members of Parliament and with my constituents in order to encourage its celebration in all ridings.

National neighbourhood day was first held in the summer of 1991 on the second Sunday in June of that year. Joannie Halas of Winnipeg organized a party to salute her neighbours and encourage Canadians across the country to do the same.

Last year it was estimated that 10,000 parties were held across Canada and the numbers for this year which took place last week are still being counted. National neighbourhood day affords all of us the opportunity to appreciate our neighbours and encourage community safety and crime prevention.

I believe it is an event that should be recognized annually across Canada by designating the second Sunday in June as national neighbourhood day, a non-statutory holiday. It is for this reason that I ask the House to support this project in the future.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Mr. Layton moves that the bill be now read the first time and printed.

Pursuant to Standing Order 69(1), the motion is deemed adopted.

Bill read the first time and printed.

* * *

PETITIONS

CHILD SUPPORT

Ms. Lynn Hunter (Saanich—Gulf Islands): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition with over 2,700 signatures to stop taxing child support payments in the hands of custodial parents.

The government system of taxing child support payments is a major contributing factor to the poverty of women and children. Two-thirds of single parent families headed by women are poor, while Canadian taxpayers provide higher income divorced fathers with huge tax breaks to the tune of $2.5 billion.

This petition was signed in a short period of time mainly by residents of British Columbia but also from all across Canada. It shows the overwhelming amount of support for changing this unfair tax policy.

I also want to recognize the very diligent work done by my colleague and friend, the member for New Westminster—Burnaby on this issue. I am honoured to submit this petition on behalf of those 2,700 petitioners.

YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT

Mr. Brian O'Kurley (Elk Island): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have the honour this afternoon to present two petitions to the House of Commons from a number of people in and around the federal riding of Elk Island. These people live in communities of Sherwood Park, Fort Saskatchewan, Ardrossan, Beaumont, New Sarepta, Leduc, Edmonton and St. Albert.

• (1725)

They call upon Parliament to change or replace the Young Offenders Act with legislation that will be a stronger deterrent to youth crime. These people are most concerned with repeat violent young offenders and recommend harsher penalties including work camps. In cases dealing with theft or property damage, they suggest financial repayment to victims of crime.

These Canadians want laws that are seen to support victims of crime rather than insulate offenders from accountability.

VIOLENCE

Mr. John Harvard (Winnipeg—St. James): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have the honour and duty to present a petition on behalf of over 350 constituents who are deeply concerned about the so-called killer cards.

These cards published by Eclipse Comic Books, True Crime Trading Cards and other publishers feature the crimes of serial killers, mass murderers and gangsters. My constituents do not want these trading cards in their community. They strongly oppose the importation of them into Canada and support the government's efforts to seize any and all shipments at the Canada-U.S. border. In this regard, I give my full support to my constituents.

These cards add nothing positive to Canadian life. Instead they contribute to violence. Therefore the petitioners ask Parliament to amend the law to prohibit the importation, sale and manufacture of killer cards into Canada.

CRUELTY TO ANIMALS

Mr. John Harvard (Winnipeg—St. James): Mr. Speaker, I have one more petition. It comes from many residents of Ontario.

They are concerned that stray animals are not properly protected and to that end they want an amendment to the cruelty to animals act to provide greater protection to these animals.

YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, I present today an additional over 40,000 signatures which petition the House to change the Young Offenders Act with an updated juvenile delinquents act.

It is in memory of Ryan Garrioch, a young man who was murdered in a school yard in Calgary. On this day I would particularly like to pay tribute to the parents who took a personal tragedy and have attempted to turn it into something that they believe will be of social benefit to Canada. That should be acknowledged in this Chamber on this last day.

Mrs. Louise Feltham (Wild Rose): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I too would like to present a large number of petitions representing thousands of petitioners from the Calgary area who are concerned about the Young Offenders Act.

These petitioners request that Parliament revise the laws of Canada to replace the Young Offenders Act with an updated juvenile delinquents act with a lowered maximum age.

I too would like to see the age reduced to reflect the wishes of most of my constituents.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. Ken James (Sarnia—Lambton): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present a petition signed by many constituents of mine in Sarnia, Corunna, Brigden and Point Edward. It has been certified correct as to form and content by the clerk.

These constituents call upon Parliament to enact legislation providing for a referendum of the people binding upon Parliament to accept or reject two official languages, English and French, for the government and people of Canada, and also to accept the acceptance or rejection of the proposed amendments to be determined by a majority vote of the total votes cast in the whole of Canada, together with a majority vote in a majority of

the provinces, with the territories being given the status of one province.

VIOLENCE

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina—Lumsden): Mr. Speaker, it is my duty and honour to present a petition signed by many residents of the city of Regina in my constituency. They say that we are increasingly becoming a culture of violence and violence has become an ordinary part of our children's lives.

Part of this culture is a serial killer board game which comes with a bag of 25 babies, the point of which is to murder as many defenceless children as possible. The laws of Canada do not deal with materials portraying torture, rape and murder as fun, including serial killer board games.

Your petitioners request that Parliament consider amending the Criminal Code of Canada so that violent degrading material such as the serial killer board game can be kept from being distributed in Canada.

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, I also want to introduce a petition with thousands of signatures calling for a ban on the serial killer board game. As the previous speaker said, the game comes with a body bag, 25 babies, four serial killer figures, the object of which is to commit murder. The person with the highest body count is the winner.

• (1730)

This is not in the interest of our youth. It is not in the interest of our Canadian society. I ask the House to ban this very offensive game.

TRADE

Mr. Ken Hughes (Macleod): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure and honour to present these certified petitions on behalf of the residents of the riding of Macleod.

These petitioners, which number in the hundreds, call for the harmonization of certain standards and procedures between Canadian and the United States meat and pork laws. They suggest that harmonization would reduce the possibility of the United States placing trade restrictions on Canadian products, thereby increasing the proper functioning and confidence in the beef marketing system in North America.

They point out that this confidence will encourage producers to make the investments necessary for us to remain competitive. These principles incidentally are embodied in Bill C-406 which I have introduced in the House and which has the signed support of more than 20 private members.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. Bill Domm (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present four petitions to the House.

The petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to enact legislation providing for a referendum of the people, binding upon Parliament, to accept or reject two official languages, English and French, for the government and the people of Canada.

The acceptance or rejection of the proposed amendments should be determined by a majority vote of the total votes cast in the whole of Canada, together with a majority vote in a majority of provinces with the territories being given the status of one province.

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina—Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have a similar petition.

The petitioners are mainly from my riding of Regina—Qu'Appelle and most of them are residents of Fort Qu'Appelle.

The petitioners ask for a referendum binding upon Parliament to accept or reject the two official languages. They state that the acceptance or rejection of the proposed amendment should be determined by a majority vote of the total votes cast in the whole of Canada together with a majority vote in the majority of provinces with the territories being given the status of one province.

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina—Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, I also have the honour to present another petition which has also been certified as correct.

These petitioners ask the Government of Canada to maintain barley under the Canadian Wheat Board. They are concerned that removing barley from the Wheat Board will further weaken it.

They call on Parliament and the government to keep barley under the responsibility of the Canadian Wheat Board.

UKRAINIAN CANADIANS

Mr. Murray W. Dorin (Edmonton Northwest): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have the honour to present today a petition, certified correct, which I received from the Ukrainian Canadian Congress.

This petition deals with the issue of redress for injustices committed against Ukrainian settlers by the Government of Canada during and following the First World War.

This petition is signed by many Edmonton residents in my riding. I would urge the government to respond to their concerns.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. David Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions. The first one is identical to the ones just presented by the member for Peterborough and by the member from Regina East. It deals with official bilingualism and calls for a referendum with respect to it in exactly the same terms as the previous petitions.

WILD HORSES

Mr. David Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast): Mr. Speaker, the second petition presented under Standing Order 36 contains the signatures of many thousands of Albertans and other Canadians on the proposed round-up, auction and slaughter of wild horses in the national wildlife park at the Canadian Forces Base Suffield.

The petitioners call for a number of other things such as a long-term management plan, legal protection for wild horses and citing the importance of horses to my part of the country.

SERIAL KILLER BOARD GAME

Mr. Murray Cardiff (Huron—Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I too have three petitions to present on behalf of the people of Huron—Bruce and from the Wingham area.

The petitioners request that Parliament consider amending the Criminal Code of Canada so that violent and degrading material such as serial killer board games can be kept from being distributed in Canada.

PEACE TRUST FUND

Mr. Murray Cardiff (Huron—Bruce): My second petition, Mr. Speaker, is from the Zurich area of my riding.

The petitioners are asking to establish a peace trust fund which would allow Canadian taxpayers who for reason of conscience or religion choose to redirect a portion of their taxes paid to government away from military uses and used in a fund where the resources would be redirected to peace, education, research, humanitarian and other peaceful purposes.

• (1735)

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. Murray Cardiff (Huron—Bruce): The last petition is similar to other petitions that have been presented today.

The petitioners ask for a referendum of the people binding upon Parliament to accept or reject two official languages, English and French, for the government and the people of Canada. I will not go through the rest of it due to the pressure of time and because it has been stated before.

MARIJUANA

Mr. Joe McGuire (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege under Standing Order 36 to present a petition from the P.E.I. Atlantic Mission Society of the Presbyterian Church in Canada.

The petitioners believe that the use of marijuana causes physical, psychological and financial implications leading to an increase in crime, family breakdowns, further addictions and many other serious problems resulting from drug abuse.

Therefore, these petitioners call on Parliament to urge the government not to legalize the use of marijuana in Canada.

I present this petition on behalf of my colleague, the member for Hillsborough.

UKRAINIAN CANADIANS

Mr. Blaine A. Thacker (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition on Ukrainian redress and internment, signed by many people from my riding.

The petitioners ask for the government to quickly conclude this ongoing negotiation. They seek the recognition that they so rightly deserve, given the conduct and treatment which they and their ancestors received, particularly during the First World War.

I petition and urge the government to move as quickly as it reasonably can in this regard.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons) moved:

That, when the House adjourns on the day of adoption of this Order, it shall stand adjourned until Monday, September 20, 1993 at 11 a.m.; and

That, at any time during such adjournment of the House, the Speaker may, after consultation with the government, cause the House to sit for the sole purpose of giving Royal Assent to a bill or bills, and following each Royal Assent, the Speaker shall, each time, further adjourn the House forthwith until Monday, September 20, 1993 at 11 a.m.

He said: Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly this will be the last time I speak in this Chamber. After 21 years in Parliament sitting on both sides of the House, in various capacities for many hours, one approaches a time like this with mixed feelings.

I remember in the early days we sat till 10 o'clock at night. I sometimes wonder if I have not spent more time in this Chamber than I have spent in any other room anywhere in the country, including my bedroom at home. So it has very much become a part of my existence and I am going to miss it. But all good things come to an end.

This is near the end of a parliamentary career for me and it is near the end of this session of Parliament, and indeed near the end of this Parliament.

I thought I would talk briefly about what we have accomplished in this session of this Parliament, which has run from May 1991 to June 1993. It has been quite momentous. We have had the constitutional initiative, the referendum, things that dominated the agenda in 1992. I thought the House would be interested to know that during that time there were 138 government bills introduced, 124 were passed at third reading in the House of Commons, 107 received royal assent, and I am sure the rest will receive royal assent soon.

A total of 265 committee reports were tabled in the House. Sixty of them asked for a government response, 41 of those were responded to and the remainder are not overdue as the reports are later. One hundred and forty six private members' bills and motions were debated; 36 were votable, four were passed and assented to.

• (1740)

Until recent years that figure would have been zero because in my entire time in opposition I think there might have been two private members' motions that actually got adopted. So changes are occurring. There were five motions carried so we had a total of nine so that a quarter of the votable bills and motions in fact were passed by this House.

Questions on the Order Paper: 537 of which 511 were answered.

Petitions, not counting the ones today: 5,100 of which 4,722 were answered. It has been by any measure productive.

My staff did a little assessment of the number of bills passed each year since 1984 and the days spent on each bill. It was kind of interesting that the average seems to be around 3.5 days spent on each bill in the House if we look at House time.

Recently there have been some accusations that I have been prone to stifle debate but since January to June of this year there were 3.6 days spent on each bill. Compare that for example with 1992 when it was 2.5 days. In fact we have spent a little more than a day longer on each bill this year compared with last year. The data do not support any suggestion of cutting off debate.

I wonder if the House might be interested in knowing how our time is spent each day in the House. I wonder if people are aware that of the time spent in the House 60 per cent is on Government Orders and the remainder is not. Of the total time, 42 per cent is actually spent on government bills. Supply days which are opposition days take 12 per cent and 6.4 per cent is on budgets. Oral Questions take up 10.3 per cent of our time. Private Members' Business takes 8.6 per cent. Routine Proceedings, petitions, et cetera take 5 per cent. Members' statements take 3.5 per cent. Adjournment proceedings

take 2.1 per cent. Other things like throne speeches, points of order, points of privilege, Speaker's rulings and so on take 10 per cent.

The accusation that the government dominates is not borne out by the facts. The facts show that the time spent on government bills represents only 42 per cent of the time this House is in session.

If we look at supply days, oral questions, Private Members' Business—admittedly those are split—members' statements, adjournment proceedings and so on I think we find that indeed the amount of total time taken by the government side of the House which has the majority of members is in the order of 55 per cent to 60 per cent. The remaining 40 per cent to 45 per cent is taken up by the opposition.

The agenda is set by the opposition. In fact any suggestions that are sometimes made that government and government only runs this institution or controls all the time is not borne out by the evidence.

One of the interesting concerns that this House has dealt with over the last couple of years has been restraint bills because the deficit has been and is a problem. We have had successive budgets bringing forward cuts to various government programs. In this session alone, from May 1991 to the session we are now just ending, there were 11 restraint bills and every single one of them was voted against by the opposition. For five of them time allocation was required because there was no willingness to end the discussion or the debate.

I thought it was instructive for the House to know this when it comes to concern about the deficit. There is a general suggestion on the opposition side: "Yes, we think the deficit is too high". Each and every measure without exception has been vigorously opposed by opposition members. If they have been making other suggestions for cuts they must be making them in a closet somewhere with the doors closed because I have not heard about that. Have they—

An hon. member: Tell us about the helicopters.

• (1745)

The hon. member shouts about helicopters. His party agreed unanimously with the report that in fact the helicopters should be purchased.

The hon. member is from Kingston which I understand has a few military votes. Would he stand up in Kingston and say he is in favour of cutting the defence budget by the $400 million a year that is in fact for the helicopters? Would he stand up in his constituency and tell the young recruits at Royal Military College that they will be sent out in frigates that are not going to have a helicopter on them because his party does not believe in them? Is he going to stand up in Kingston and tell his military people that they are expected to go on search and rescue missions in rough weather which is where they are needed with 30-year old helicopters because he is opposed to modernizing these helicopters? Is he going to go to Halifax where there will be several hundred jobs produced in building these new helicopters and say he thinks they should not have these jobs because he is opposed to those helicopters?

When he and his party are prepared to do that then they will have the right to stand up and say that they dispute this decision. Until then everything else is intellectually dishonest.

What happened on these restraint bills? Apparently people say that the Liberals are in favour of deficit reduction. Their leader in Alberta walked around with a clock. He is worried about deficits. He had a clicking counter. We hear that all the time yet they voted against every single bill.

How much time did we spend on it? In the House we spent 162 hours debating restraint bills or 61 days. We spent 55 days in committee or 82 hours. A total of 116 days was spent debating. The average time we spent per bill was 10.5 days. That is because the opposition members said that they were opposed to each and every specific cut we made: "Is the deficit a problem? Yes, we have to clear the deficit".

I say that if one seriously wants the people of Canada to vote Liberal in the next election then one will have to do better than that.

Mr. Milliken: The deficit keeps going up.

Mr. Andre: The hon. member says that the deficit keeps going up. What is his suggestion? It is to vote against every restraint bill and every cutback bill. There is only one other alternative to cutbacks and that is to raise taxes. Is he going to have the intellectual honesty? Is the opposition going to have the intellectual honesty to say it is in favour of raising taxes? Is it going to be honest enough with the people of Canada? It cannot

have it all ways. It cannot vote against every restraint, suggest no others, say the deficit is a problem and not raise taxes. That is impossible.

The hon. member has more integrity than that and I am sure he will be ashamed when he thinks about what he is saying now. He will be ashamed to his core when he thinks about what he is saying now. He knows that intellectual honesty and integrity is not a requirement to be an active Liberal or a prominent Liberal.

We have had a very productive session. It amazes me when I read the front page of *The Ottawa Citizen*, that great newspaper in our national capital. It said that a number of bills have died on the Order Paper. It is about 0.6 per cent of the bills introduced.

It never would occur to that organization to say it was a very productive session. That might be the truth but I think that any reporter who did that would be fired by the editor because good news is not tolerated. What they must do is denigrate, criticize and ridicule every Canadian institution. We give Geminis to people who produce films saying the Canadian Air Force contributed more to the misery of German civilians than it did to fighting Nazism. We award millions of dollars to people who produce films that say Billy Bishop was a liar and a fraud. We run newspapers in this country that do nothing but criticize continuously and have nothing good to say about this country. I am not talking about the government, I am talking about everything. I think they do serious damage to this institution.

• (1750)

I will miss this institution. I am proud of the 21 years I have spent here. I think this is a worth-while place to be. It is an important place to be. It is an important job, but my goodness it is sobering to talk to people who might consider running to replace me and hear what they say about this job. They say: "Just a minute now. You want me to give up my career, give up my relationship with my family, fight to win an election to come to Ottawa to get abused, be accused of being a thief, to be accused of being interested in nothing but pork barrelling and fraud and be treated with the contempt that the media treats all politicians. Why would I do that? Do you think I am crazy? Why would I do that?"

When we hear that answer a few times we stop and think. I do not care what party we are talking about, if the good people in this country are taking that kind of message from what they read and see, then where does that lead us? Is that going to lead to improved representation? Is that going to lead to a stronger House of Commons? Is that going to lead to better government? Is that going to lead to a better country? The answer to all those questions is no.

If there is one disappointment I have, particularly in the last three years as House leader, it is that we have not been able to turn around that question of how people view this House and how we are viewed as politicians. On both sides of the House, with precious few exceptions, the men and women I have had the pleasure to work with are honourable, decent and well-meaning. They are here at considerable financial sacrifice as well as sacrifice in terms of their families and other obligations without exception on both sides of the House.

Yet to read what is written about us is to believe we are all overpaid, greedy, selfish, dishonest and do not give a damn about anything except our own welfare. That has not been my experience, not in 21 years. I despair sometimes at what these critics are doing to this institution and this country.

I wish for once they would stop, think a little bit and take a little responsibility for what they write. They should check the facts and not get so excited when they catch somebody tripping up. This condemnation of politicians is gotcha journalism. We hear members of the national press gallery saying that all politicians are liars. What is an individual like that doing reporting to the people of Canada? What is an individual like that doing? That is one of my disappointments.

I think it is a serious problem. I do not have an answer or a solution. I hope the next Parliament will have the wisdom to find a solution because a solution needs to be found to that particular problem.

Mr. Speaker, that being said at the end of the day what counts is how we feel about ourselves; all of us, that side and this side. Do we feel good about ourselves? Have we done the best we can do? Speaking personally, I feel pretty good. I do not claim perfection. God there are a lot of things I said I wish I had not said. There are some things I did that I wish I had not done. I wish I had been a little more careful about the feelings of those who were

at the receiving end of some of my attacks. I perhaps have not been as sensitive as I should have been. I assume everybody has a hide of beef as thick as mine and that is not always true.

• (1755)

On balance there is really no finer occupation or finer thing we can do than serve our fellow citizens of this great country in this wonderful institution. For that I am eternally grateful to my constituents of Calgary Centre who honoured me with six elections in a row. To my friends on both sides who I have enjoyed and still enjoy, I hope we will be friends afterwards and I thank them for the experiences.

The table officers and those in the House of Commons are professionals. They have been superb. I have had absolutely no complaints at all with the Clerk and others in terms of the House of Commons. It has been a wonderful experience. I hope when all is said and done others can reach the judgment that it was worth while for me to be here. In any event it has been marvellous.

This is a better institution with better people than is sometimes recognized if the only source of information comes from some in the national press gallery. It is a great institution and it has been a pleasure to have been a part of it.

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Madam Speaker, following the speech of the government House leader from Calgary Centre, I must say that being from the same class of 1972 I had to work with the member from Calgary Centre for several years. Although we sometimes disagreed I think that most of us have kept respect for each other and I would like to tell him that this place will miss him.

We hope he goes on to a career that will give him the chance to use his great qualities again. I am positive that whatever activity he takes upon himself to do will be done with the utmost care and devotion. I know it is not an easy job to be government House leader. He had to get the job done.

I had a friend here some years ago. His name was Walter Baker. He was in the Ottawa area and was also the government House leader. Walter was a good companion. I liked him and used to kid him. I would say: "Walter you are a heck of a nice guy. It is the gang you hang around with I cannot stand". Sometimes we get into partisan politics but that is part of the process I guess and part of the game.

The minister is right. This House of Commons is probably going to adjourn and the next election will probably result in a lot of new faces around here. I will stand again for election and I hope the people of my riding of Ottawa—Vanier will have confidence in me again. I like and enjoy what I am doing here. I hope their confidence will be renewed. I also believe there is no greater calling than to serve one's constituents. Like many others in this place I have grown to like the House and the people who work here.

I do think we get a raw deal sometimes from the press that says members of Parliament are here to further their own aims and feather their own nests. Sometimes there are people you would not trust to invite to supper.

Like the minister I have been here 20 long years. I sincerely hope that we can change the image in the next few years so that the people of Canada have respect and understanding. The job is not easy. It is sometimes challenging, but it is sure as heck rewarding to the extent that some of us want to come back here and repeat the experience. To those who are leaving from the class of '72, and the member for Calgary Centre has announced he will not run again, I say have a good trip and God bless you all.

• (1800)

I have to address on the adjournment motion some of the items to which the minister alluded at the beginning of his speech. That is the record of this government, the record of this Parliament. It sometimes is good to look back on these things to see where we were at and where we are going.

Last weekend we had the Tory leadership convention of which, Madam Speaker, you were one of the co-chairmen. I congratulate you. I think you did a very nice and very good job. Not alluding to your presence but to all the rhetoric that was put out, I thought for a while we were being fed a lot of historical revisionism by the Tories. Some of them have short memories. Some of the

Canadian people who were deeply affected by some of the government's decisions, in my view, have not kept the same kind of memories that the minister alluded to a few minutes ago.

We did not hear a lot about high unemployment in Canada or a doubling of the national debt. We did not hear of the weakening of our national institutions. It is no surprise that Canadians have lost confidence in this Conservative government and have lost it for some time now. We are hoping and praying for a quick election so that we can replace it.

There will be a new Prime Minister in this House come the next election. We hope that the situation will improve with the election of a new government and a new Prime Minister.

The new Prime Minister who will be sworn in on June 25 next, the hon. member for Vancouver Centre, will have a hard time trying to distance herself from the past record. I do not think it is that glorious a record that she will want to run on it. As a matter of fact, there are rumours now that she may recall the House in July to come in with a throne speech and possibly a budget.

The time is short. The Prime Minister-elect to be sworn in on June 25 will want to get some kind of momentum going on her own and for that we wish her good luck, but we do not think that there is enough time now for her to do this at this juncture.

[*Translation*]

Although the new Prime Minister will have to try to dissociate herself from her predecessor's policies, the fact remains that the policies which she herself preached in her leadership campaign reaffirm her commitment to continue the Conservative government policies we have known since 1984. One of her backers in the leadership race, Minister Wilson, was the father of the GST, one of the taxes Canadians hate most.

It is not surprising to us that most of the front bench ministers and some long-serving members of this House are leaving for other occupations. I think they got the message. Clearly, they have no chance of being re-elected and they will leave it to others to run for office.

[*English*]

Obviously, the Tories are afraid to now go to the polls. They will hesitate to the end, flying in the face of the usual tradition that we have an election every four years.

• (1805)

I do not want to dwell too much on that because it is a difficult situation when the record's as negative as the one of this government. To run on such a record is sometimes defeatist in itself. Let us take a look at the record.

Canadians will remember the expression jobs, jobs, jobs in 1984. That was the Prime Minister telling Canadians that his government would create jobs, jobs, jobs. The outgoing Prime Minister has, in my view, a government which mismanaged the economy into the worst recession since the early 1930s. Despite the boom years of the mid 1980s it succeeded in giving us an unemployment rate in 1992 of 11.3 per cent, a high of 11.8 per cent in November, up from 10.3 per cent in 1991. As of April of this year, 1993, the unemployment rate in Canada is 11.4 per cent. Forecasters say that the experts tell us that it is unlikely that the unemployment rate will fall below 11 per cent in 1993.

Meanwhile the average rate of unemployment in the industrialized world, with all the other comparables in all the other industrialized countries with which we compare ourselves, is less than 8 per cent. We are leading on unemployment, yet we must remember jobs, jobs, jobs.

What caused it? A great effect was had on the job employment of Canadians by the free trade agreement with the United States. Free trade was an issue in the 1988 election. We were told at the time that free trade would be the end-all and be-all for the economic future of Canada and there would be jobs, jobs and jobs. The government promised at that time there would be some work force adjustment programs which we never saw. The government had promised that there would be some kind of consideration for those jobs which would disappear to the United States.

We know now that there are hundreds of thousands of Canadians who have given up looking for work and are waiting at home for economic renewal. Money has run out for training courses in some areas. There were 400,000 manufacturing jobs that were lost since 1989. A

great majority of those were in my province of Ontario. It is expected that two-thirds of these 400,000 jobs will never return. Many of those were good paying jobs.

In 1992, 61,822 people and 14,317 businesses went bankrupt.

[*Translation*]

That is 4.8 per cent more than in 1991. For the third straight year, we have had a record number of bankruptcies. Madam Speaker, I ask who in 1988 promised to reduce unemployment insurance premiums considerably and to raise UI benefits? The Conservatives. Who said that UI premiums would go down? That is false; premiums were increased twice. Changes to the UI Act reduced eligibility for benefits.

Since the Conservatives took office in September 1984, taxes increased 38 times. In 1991, Canadian households paid $21.8 billion more in income tax, not counting transfer payments, than they would have if the tax system had remained as it was in 1984. The corporate share of federal income tax revenue went from 13.2 per cent in 1984-85 to 10.4 per cent in 1990-91. The richest 1 per cent of the population pay less income tax after the first phase of the Conservatives' tax reform than they did in 1984. The rich pay less today than they did in 1984.

• (1810)

A study by Canadian Business Economics, published recently under the title *Taking Stock of Tory Tax Reform*, revealed that the average family now pays $1,884 more in taxes, not including the GST, than when the Conservatives took power.

No wonder Canadians have lost confidence. Today, more than two million Canadians are living on welfare. In my own province, Ontario, one person in ten depends on welfare. In 1991, two million Canadians went to food banks, and 40 per cent were children under the age of 18. Canada has more food banks than McDonald's restaurants. An estimated 3.8 million Canadians were living below the poverty line in 1990, at the beginning of the recession. In 1990, 60.6 per cent of women heading single parent families were living in poverty. In my own riding, 20 per cent of the families, in other words, one family out of five, is a single parent family, and the vast majority of these live below the poverty line.

Most of the poor have a full-time and a part-time job. They have to work to make ends meet, to try to find some way of meeting the often substantial needs of their family within an economic framework that offers them very little.

[*English*]

There was no progress in the war against poverty during the Mulroney era. Poverty has increased among children. Between 1989 and 1990 an additional 171,000 children joined the ranks of the poor. All together 1,105,000 children or 16.6 per cent lived in poverty in 1990. The numbers have probably increased since then. Again, this is unacceptable for everyone including, I would hope, all those Tories over there.

In 1988 the government promised to spend $6.4 billion to create 400,000 new day care spaces by 1995. Instead the day care promise was abandoned, making it even more difficult for Canadians to escape the cycle of poverty.

[*Translation*]

Who eliminated the federal co-operative housing program in 1992 and cut the budget for subsidized housing? The Conservative government.

Last Saturday in my riding, I had the privilege of attending the official opening of a housing co-operative, the Coopérative Desloges, located in the eastern part of my riding. Ontario is the only province that still has a co-operative movement. It is the only province in Canada where people can still have access to a co-operative housing program. Now that the federal government has abandoned and abolished the program, Ontario is the only province where co-operative housing is still feasible. In fact, I must say that the Conservative government's record in this respect is pitiful.

In 1983, the Prime Minister promised to reduce the national debt and the annual deficit. Every year, and the Public Accounts are there to prove it, the forecasts were way off the mark, to the tune of several billion dollars. Today, we have an annual deficit of nearly $34 billion. We have a national debt of around $460 billion. That is a lot of money, and Canadians have every right to expect

members and governments to answer the following questions: Where are we going? What are we going to do? There are things we can do.

[*English*]

The present Prime Minister failed to take advantage of the boom years of the mid-1980s and take control of that debt. Instead he and his government became obsessed with inflation, a problem that we were told at that time existed in Toronto but nowhere else. As interest rates were held high to put the brakes on growth, the engine slowed in Toronto but much of the rest of the country withered.

• (1815)

The Tories intentionally created the first made in Canada recession. Once they had created it they refused to recognize its depth, leading us to our current situation.

They also tried to put much of the blame on global forces and economic slow-downs in other countries. Some economists place the blame squarely on this government's shoulders.

A recent study by the Institute for Policy Analysis at the University of Toronto says that higher federal taxes and the fight against inflation precipitated the recession in 1990 and were the main causes of the sluggish recovery.

In 1991 the recession worsened as the impact of the U.S. slow-down was felt and the goods and services tax was implemented. Imagine that. At the worst moment they came in with a consumer tax which added 1.5 points inflation and did the same thing as if one were to step on the gas and use the brakes at the same time. It does not go very far.

Madam Speaker, I notice you are giving me a signal that I only have one minute left. I wish I could have gone on to further explain how this government has been really incompetent and unable to cope with the challenge of the 1990s. I know that a lot of members of my caucus would like to address this adjournment debate tonight.

[*Translation*]

In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 26(1), I move:

That the House continue to sit beyond the ordinary hour of daily adjournment for the purpose of consideration of this adjournment motion.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All members opposed to the motion will please rise?

And fewer than 15 members having risen:

Madam Deputy Speaker: Fewer than 15 members having risen, the motion is therefore carried.

Motion agreed to.

[*English*]

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops): Madam Speaker, I am happy to rise today to participate in this adjournment debate. I listened with interest to my colleague from Calgary Centre, the government House leader. I would actually echo many of his remarks in terms of this institution. In many ways people have gone out of their way to criticize and ridicule the parliamentary system and have accused members of all sorts of dastardly deeds, most of which are completely inaccurate.

However it is not a perfect system and we ask ourselves what system would be better. I think we would all agree that there are a number of reforms we would like to see incorporated in our parliamentary system. At the top of the list would be to abolish the existing Senate and replace it with something more reflective of a democratic system, certainly an elected Senate. There could be a whole number of changes to the way this institution is run.

A committee has been working on these reforms for the last few weeks. It has now submitted a report and the Standing Orders are being drafted to reflect these changes, which will create a much more inclusive House of Commons in which the role of backbenchers will be elevated, more people will be included in decision making and Question Period will be run in a more appropriate way to the needs of governments of the 1990s. Certainly the call for reform is there.

I wanted to think of something nice to say about my friend from Calgary Centre whom I have had the pleasure of working with for many years. A number of things actually come to mind. The one thing about the member for Calgary Centre is that one never wonders where he stands on an issue. One is never perplexed in terms of his position or in wonderment about his point of view on literally any issue or topic.

He is very straightforward, frank and honest, and as a result he is an easy person to deal with in that respect. As a House leader who was always in a position to carry on negotiations with the hon. member for Calgary Centre I always appreciated his frankness and openness and his

willingness not to debate or discuss but at least to share his view as to how events ought to proceed in here.

• (1820)

I wish him well. In many ways he has served his government well. He was given a tough task to move very unpopular legislation through the House of Commons. He did that well. We would certainly criticize the way he has done many things but he has fulfilled the terms of his job description, which is to move government legislation expeditiously. As a result of his approach, to a large extent, more legislation was passed in this Parliament than in probably any other Parliament in Canadian history.

I wish his wife and his family well. Whatever the member for Calgary Centre does in the future I know he will do it with the same dedication with which he has applied himself to serving his government and the House of Commons. I wish his family Godspeed and wealth in their years ahead.

To turn to the task at hand, and that is to discuss this adjournment debate, it is rather a sad day for the country when we are wrapping up this parliamentary session with a number of things that spring instantly to mind. One is that in my judgment Canadians have become very frustrated with the Government of Canada. One of the reasons they have become frustrated is because in many respects this government has changed the face of our country.

In 1988 when the Prime Minister was campaigning across the country he came to Kamloops, as did the member for Yellowhead and a whole set of ministers. They said that if we passed the free trade agreement then we would create jobs, jobs, jobs. What they did not tell us was that those jobs were going to be created in the United States. We thought they meant they would be created in Canada.

As a result it is fair to say that Canadians would have to answer no to the following questions today: Nine years after the present government was first elected in 1984 is my life better today in terms of its future than it was then? Is my job, my career or my profession more secure than it was in 1984? Do my children more obviously have a good future than back in 1984? Is Canada a more productive and dynamic place than it was in 1984?

The polls tell us that. Canadians are very uncertain about the future. They show that 70 per cent of Canadians are unsure whether they are going to have a job in the immediate future and whether there is any economic security for them and their families. There is probably nothing worse than a society in which people are actually worried and are wondering whether they will be able to provide for themselves and their families in the future. That undermines a lot of the confidence people have in their government institutions and other institutions, be they trade unions or chambers of commerce. People are questioning whether these agencies, organizations and so on are able to provide for them as in the past.

There are four million Canadians who would normally be working at a decent job and who presently are not because they are either fully out of work, jobless, or they are significantly underemployed, working only a few hours a week. No wonder we have a deficit in this country. There are four million Canadians who are under-utilized in the work place, who are obviously not creating the revenues and paying the taxes they would want to be paying. The cost of unemployment insurance and various social service programs is tremendously draining on the federal government.

No wonder we have a deficit situation in this country. The best way to get Canada working is to get Canadians working. We should be taking major steps, such as we have seen other countries take, to ensure that Canadians are getting back to work.

Let us look at Japan for example. It recognized that its unemployment rate had skyrocketed to 3.5 per cent. The Government of Japan said that it had to do something about that. It introduced a massive program that would put Japanese men and women to work. It acknowledged that if people are working then they are paying taxes of all sorts and it is not costing the government revenues, unemployment insurance, welfare and the like.

• (1825)

So they have taken steps. Even President Clinton in the United States has decided to attempt to move a package through Congress again. Its sole purpose is to

provide employment, education and training for an increasing number of American men and women.

What are we doing? At the top of the list we have the NAFTA, this Mexico—U.S.—Canada trade deal. I do not want to be terribly simplistic about this but we are saying that we want to get into a situation in terms of continental North America in which our manufacturers, suppliers and producers are competing with someone in a country like Mexico which pays its employees 58 cents an hour.

It does not take a rocket scientist to figure out what the implication of this is for the future of our country, to say nothing about the present. Let us think of the thousands of young people coming out of our school systems, colleges, technical schools, business schools, universities and so on who are now looking for gainful employment so they can play their rightful role in the development of this country.

They are now being confronted with a situation in which an employer who has a factory, plant, mill or processing system, whether it is data processing or processing lumber, now has a choice to make. The employer could locate the operation in Canada and pay $18 an hour, in the northern tier of the United States and pay $12 an hour for the same level of expertise or training, move it down to Louisiana, Mississippi or southern Texas and pay $7 an hour, or move it down over the Rio Grande and pay 58 cents an hour.

If one's job as an industrialist or a business person is to maximize the profits to one's shareholders and one could pay people $18 an hour or 58 cents an hour for similar skills then it does not take much imagination to know where one is going to move the operations. We do not have to do more than turn on our television sets and listen to Ross Perot in the United States. He is a multi-millionaire, a man who has made a small fortune, who when asked how he reacted to the NAFTA said that he could take his fortune and increase it five-fold in the next few years if he moved a good number of his operations into Mexico. If he could pay his employees 58 cents an hour with virtually no benefits then he could make a lot more money than he is now making in the United States.

He said that if the NAFTA is signed there will be a massive flushing sound as jobs are flushed from northern United States and Canada into Mexico. That is the reality.

We might say there are other benefits and so on but the reality is basically that we are being asked to tilt the playing field in Canada from wages of $18 an hour down to compete with somebody who is being paid 58 cents an hour. These are the extremes, but that is what we are up against.

We have already seen it. Previous speakers have indicated that since the free trade deal with the United States was introduced over 400,000 manufacturing jobs have been lost as plant operators, and we cannot blame them, moved their operations to the United States because there was no need to keep the branch plant in Canada open.

Let us face it. We are 48 hours by truck from the Mexican border, which means that any manufactured products can be delivered to Canada within 48 hours. That is the kind of continental system we are talking about. There were 400,000 manufacturing jobs lost. Many of those jobs will never come back.

We are talking about the future. What incentive will there be for a Canadian entrepreneur, a Canadian business person or a Canadian industrialist to locate their operation in Canada when they can locate it in the southern states or northern Mexico and pay their employees a third or a tenth of what they are paying here in Canada, knowing those finished products have full access throughout continental North America? There is very little incentive. That is the kind of legacy the present government is leaving us.

The other critical matter, and I cannot leave the discussion on the NAFTA without referring to it, is that there is no question when we look at that trade agreement that there are some areas of it from which the government has said that it wants to be excluded. Raw logs is one of them. In other words, we do not want to sell raw logs to the United States for processing. We do not want to send our raw logs to Mexico for processing. Raw logs are excluded.

• (1830)

There is another area that is excluded and that is unprocessed fish. On the east coast, Atlantic Canada and parts of Quebec, unprocessed fish cannot be moved for processing down to the United States.

Those are two items. The one item that is conspicuously absent is fresh water. Our lakes and rivers, in my judgment, are now for sale to the highest bidder, be that an American firm or in the future, a Mexican firm. Do we really want to sell this last resource as we would a chunk of coal or a piece of copper or a codfish?

Is water like that? I do not think it is. Water is life itself. We would be well advised, knowing the pressures that will be coming in the future as populations increase in the southwestern United States and northern Mexico, to have as much influence as we can to ensure that those water resources are here for future generations of Canadians before we start giving it away or selling it off as simply another commodity.

Those people who say that water is not part of the NAFTA agreement are doing a real disservice to the people of Canada. Significantly the witnesses who appeared before the committee hearings, as limited as they were, were very clear that water is included. Some of the politicians across the way say it is not, but I will listen to the experts, particularly those experts in international trade.

I want to refer to one other item and that is the GST. The GST was introduced allegedly, at least this is what people were told, to reduce the deficit. The deficit has not been reduced. The deficit continues to be about the same as it was year after year after year.

The GST is doing something to the Canadian economy that I do not think we can stand by and passively ignore. The GST has turned into a virtual killer tax for small businesses. What is particularly bad about it is that small businesses are creating the jobs now and into the future. It is not the large corporations, not the Crown corporations, but those small businesses with 10, 20, 30 or 40 employees. That is where the jobs are. As more and more corporations recognize they are like lumbering dinosaurs in an ever-changing economy, they are hiving off more and more of their work to smaller firms or offshoots of their large corporate organizations.

That is where the jobs of the future are and yet small business is being absolutely smothered by the GST. Not only that, because of the GST there is not a single member of Parliament in here who does not know that the underground economy now is growing because of it. The whole tax system is bizarre, but the GST now has driven even more of the economy underground.

The last guesstimate I heard at a finance conference in Toronto recently is that about $100 billion annual transactions are in underground economy transactions and therefore untaxed. If that is accurate or even in the ball park, that is the deficit. Under normal taxation levels, if that underground economy was brought up on the table to be taxed as we do all business transactions, that would take care of the deficit.

More and more Canadians now are in a barter system, are paying cash for building a new house or a new cottage. I just talked to two or three people within the last week who are having houses built and paying cash for almost all of the construction because it saves them, they feel, about 25 to 30 per cent on a brand new house. Of course none of that is taxed.

People say: "If you do not have the GST, where are you going to get the money?" It is a very legitimate question.

Let me give two or three examples. One is this family trust notion. I do not know how my colleagues across the way actually passed that, but when that family trust tax provision went to the finance committee, I went to that committee meeting because I just could not believe it was as bad as people were saying it was. The tax experts said they could not believe the government was doing this. It is a giveaway to the richest families in this country, where they are able to avoid taxes for an entire generation.

Is that the kind of taxes we want? Why would the government include that kind of a tax provision? But they did. How many billions of dollars are going untaxed because of that provision alone?

What about a wealth tax? The other day on the business pages of *The Globe and Mail*, one of the major bonding firms was saying that we are one of the few countries in the western world that does not have a wealth tax so that those people who inherit, say, $10 million dollars should pay some tax on it.

• (1835)

Virtually every country in the world does that except Canada. Who inherits $10 million? It goes back to the very wealthiest families and they get this windfall tax break. We could go through our tax system right now,

look at those tax loopholes, loophole after loophole, and start closing them off.

When we go to the stadiums around the country and see those big boxes filled with people having a few drinks, eating little sandwiches and so on, having free tickets, those are all tax deductions. Why should the people who are working be paying for their tickets to the football game, the hockey game, or baseball game and some people sit up in the big boxes all tax free, paid for by the taxpayers of Canada? Why would we allow that to happen and to continue year after year?

Obviously we need to do a number of things. We need to re-examine the GST and find ways of replacing it within our existing tax system through proper tax reform. I believe we have to abandon this notion of NAFTA before we lose everything that makes any sense in terms of future jobs for our young people and their children of the future.

We obviously have to be cognizant of the fact that our health care system is at extreme risk to a certain extent because of the off-loading the federal government has been doing. In my judgment it has not been paying its fair share toward the establishment and maintenance of a health care system that is universal across Canada so that the same service would exist in P.E.I., Manitoba or British Columbia. It is in danger of changing. We are soon going to find we have 12 different health care systems as opposed to one if we are not careful.

If there is one thing we must do in the future it is to acknowledge the fact that the most important people in this country are young people and those people that are working to upgrade, reskill and improve themselves in order to play their rightful role in the economy. That means post-secondary education. That means our colleges, vocational schools, universities, business schools and so on, which allow Canadians to improve their skills and their ability to compete locally and internationally. We must place more emphasis on the whole area that we generally call post-secondary education. That simply means more financial support and perhaps using what existing financial support we have in a better and smarter way.

In closing I simply want to say those are the last few hours of this session of the House of Commons. The next time we come together will be after the general election. The people of Canada will have a chance to evaluate what the various political parties put forward during the election campaign and to be part of that great process that we call democracy. Thank goodness we have such a process.

Mr. Blaine A. Thacker (Lethbridge): Madam Speaker, I feel privileged to rise and speak on this adjournment motion on the last day of this Parliament and on my last day here as a legislator, having spent some 14 years in that capacity.

On the one hand when I listen to the members who have retired from the classes of '72 and '68, the ones who have been here 25 years, 14 years seems like a very short period. Maybe I should be running again. On the other hand when I realize that the average tenure of a member of Parliament is less than five years, 14 years seems like a long time and 25 years seems like forever.

If I might I could spend my whole time rebutting the points made the hon. member for Kamloops. In fact I could give his speech, never as good as he does, but I could give all of the points he has made because he makes them again and again and again. He continues to make those points in spite of the fact that they have been carefully answered to the fullest extent and to show that they are simply not correct. But I will not do that.

Suffice to say with respect to the comments that my friend from Kamloops has made, Canada has to decide if we want to be part of the global world economy, which we must as a trading nation when over one-third of our income comes from global trade, or whether we want to be a little island of 26 million people with a wall of China around us. Canadians know instinctively that we cannot isolate ourselves and have the high standard of living we have.

• (1840)

In the election in Alberta the New Democratic Party was entirely shut out. It did not get one seat. That is simply a reflection of how well the ordinary citizen understands the difference between the socialist philosophy and how that reflects itself in the reality of their lives having seen what has occurred in B.C., Saskatchewan and particularly in Ontario.

I am confident that Canadians, when they get to an election, will once again choose a Progressive Conservative government because in fact, like the distinguished member for Calgary Centre, we face facts. We make

decisions based on the reality of today rather than on some ephemeral idealistic socialistic view of the world.

I am here first of all to express my thanks to the electors and citizens of Lethbridge and southwestern Alberta who by their votes have permitted me the privilege of being their representative here in Ottawa for the last 14 years. They did so in four general elections and they returned me with majorities each time. For that I thank them.

You will notice, Madam Speaker, that I used the word representative because to me that is a special word as compared to the word delegate. I have never believed that I was a delegate with an obligation to go home and to try by some mechanism to decide what a majority of my electors from Lethbridge would want to do. That is what a delegate would do and would come down like a machine and cast a ballot.

No, no. A member of Parliament is a representative. I represent that area. But I am a member who speaks for all of Canada and must consider the interests, the judgment and particularly the points of view of other Canadians. A representative has an obligation of course to listen to the views, the opinions and the judgment of one's electors. One has an obligation though to listen to the views expressed by other members of Parliament who themselves have been elected by 100,000-plus people and come with a different perspective.

The big difference in our country now, Madam Speaker, as you so well know is no longer Catholic, Protestant, French, English, Quebec, the rest of Quebec. The big differences now are people who come from large metropolitan areas and those of us who come from smaller cities and people who come from the rural parts of Canada. That is the adjustment, the compromise and the consideration that we have to spend a lot of time on as members.

We also as members and representatives have an obligation to read about the topic in the legislation we are faced with and to study the issue and then face the ultimate responsibility to make a judgment call and to act in the best interest of all of Canada.

I have been very proud to be a representative and even though I have made decisions that many people in my riding have been opposed to, most of them have come and said that I have been a reasonable representative and have acted fairly in the interest of the country.

Another word of thanks would be to my staff who over a period of 14 years have served me very well. I cannot name them all but there are a few who I would like to mention. Mrs. Sheelagh Brown served on this Hill many years before I came and continued with me for many years as did Mr. Robert Harrison. Mr. James Christie has worked many years in the riding. Those people face a particular problem because all of the anger and the unhappiness of people tends to be focused upon our staff. Mr. Jamie Christie has served me so very well in that capacity. Mr. David Robins, Mr. Darrell Pack, Mrs. Kathy Dedo-Markus, Ms. Cathy Tron, my present staff in Ottawa, Anne Lanier, Alan Andron, Bridget Pastor Jr. and Meagan Thompson have all worked hard not only for me but for the best interest of the people of Lethbridge. For that I thank them.

What can I say in summary? It is certainly better to win than to lose and I have done both. It is better to be in government than it is to be in opposition and I have been in both. The reason it is better to be in government is that you can, even as an individual member of Parliament, have an influence and change the legislation and the policy of this country. Even when you make a mistake, and we have made a few, you can regroup in the morning and come back and try to do better because you still have the power.

• (1845)

As a westerner I can remember when I first came here. We had three traditional beefs that we were all raised upon and fed with at the knees of our grandfathers, grandmothers and our parents. One was the manufacturing tariffs that it was felt in the west put an unfair burden upon us because most of the manufacturing products came out of central Canada. There is quite a bit of mythology around that and factually often it is not correct. But that was the mythology. Now they are all gone and we do not have that historic complaint in the west. That will go a long way toward making us feel more and more like we are part of the whole country.

Transportation inequities. We always heard how we had to pay the freight on the raw products leaving the prairies and on the manufactured goods coming back. Over the last few years we have had a very sophisticated

manufacturing sector in the west and the transportation inequities have been substantially done away with. For example, the cost of shipping on the railways has dropped some 27 per cent since 1984. That is very helpful to us. The tariffs which are essentially taxes upon our own people are now largely a thing of the past.

With regard to the lack of continental marketing, from western Canada there was a lot of support for the Liberal Party when it was the party that wanted to get into *laissez faire* in free trade agreements in continental marketing. That was the traditional Liberal position. The Conservative Party opposed it because the Conservative Party was so locked into its trade links and its idea of being part of the British Empire that the Conservative Party opposed free trade again and again. That was never in the interest of western Canada.

I have been proud to be part of a government that had the courage to face it, take the hard decisions and then go to the people and actually win. In my judgment the last act of emancipation of Canadians which freed us up as a true country and nation in the world was the reaffirmation of free trade where they returned us to power having put that to them. Canada truly grew up when we realized we were part of the world and could face the world under a free trade agreement.

On an entirely personal basis, I want to say how much I enjoyed working on the policy and the legislative end, whether that was in transportation, justice or a little bit in agriculture. I really thank the Prime Minister for giving me interesting assignments as a committee member, as chairman of standing committees and legislative committees and two parliamentary secretaryships. The access to information and privacy report which we put in a number of years ago will one day come to be seen by parliamentarians as the basis for making changes to those statutes. I sat on a task force that reviewed national security which gave me a very interesting perspective of this country and more recently a report involved in the recodification of the Criminal Code.

I also want to thank the Prime Minister for the national leadership that he has provided on federal-provincial relations, on fiscal matters and on social matters. I am firmly convinced that history will vindicate the positions that he took and will see him in the proper light. I must say that of all his strengths intellectually and on the issues, he never lost sight of the fact that we were his caucus.

You will know, Madam Speaker, that I had an operation in 1990. I was recovering during the Christmas period. On Boxing Day, lo and behold the telephone rang. I just picked it up in the normal course and it was the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister was personally calling a backbencher who is not important at all in the scheme of things day to day, but he was concerned enough that he phoned. I thought that was quite a wonderful thing.

My only regret is the treatment that the national media have given because they really refused in the case of our Prime Minister to give a balanced presentation of his persona.

• (1850)

If they had done that, had they even just been fair, he would have been around here for many more years because he had so much more to give.

This brings me to my last issue and it relates to the role of the media. It is not I think for Parliament to do anything about it but I believe the national press gallery has to somehow come together and set up a governing body and a disciplining body where they can bring some internal self-control and discipline upon themselves.

Regretfully I have noticed that over the last 14 years they have become highly destructive toward the public life of this nation. They have focused on personal traits of members of Parliament and other people in positions of responsibility in this nation. These are personal traits that are largely irrelevant to their ability to govern the nation. In short, they have been unbalanced and they have been unfair.

As I say the solution is not a statutory matter but a question of professional discipline. As better and more educated people go into journalism and aspire to a higher professional standard of journalism that should stress balanced reporting, both sides of the story, fairness and more than anything else relevancy to the issue at hand. At that time I believe the public life of the nation will be much better.

In conclusion, I am proud to have been a politician.

Mr. Ron MacDonald (Dartmouth): Madam Speaker, this is a bit of an historic day I guess for anybody who is watching. We are all guessing because it will be up to the new Prime Minister once she is sworn in to decide when this place finally does adjourn for good and when to have a general election.

I think for anybody who has listened to the debate that this is the day a lot of members of this place are giving their speeches. Indeed Mr. Paproski yesterday as a matter of fact had many tributes paid to him for his long service to this place and for the friendship and for the changes that he brought to this place.

Before I start I would like to say for the record that Steve Paproski, if I can be so bold as to break the rules, is one of those rare individuals who actually has some influence on rookies coming into this place. As Acting Speaker, Mr. Paproski was helpful many times in this place by the way that he handled himself and the way that he allowed some of us newer guys to sometimes bend the rules but never quite break them. He sent over little notes to try to tell us how we might be able to do it a little better the next time. He was certainly helpful to me. It is a pleasure to have served with somebody of that stature.

When I learned that Mr. Paproski was not going to be here again it caused me a little concern. He is the type of individual who certainly has brought a lot to this place and has brought a lot of respect here and I will certainly miss him from here. I wish him the best.

Today the debate is on something else. This is the adjournment debate. The adjournment debate that we are talking about is really about the government's record. This may be the last time that many people get to speak in this place. Certainly it is probably the last time in this Parliament that most of us will get to speak in this place.

It is a time for reflection. Almost five years ago the previous government went to the polls and we had a general election. We had the great Canadian debate about free trade. During that debate people took sides. It was an emotional argument. Many times the facts just did not make any difference. Nevertheless we had a national election campaign in which people felt very strongly about the issue of free trade.

The government opposite had campaigned that free trade would not only open up the United States market to our producers and to our products but would lead us to unprecedented growth in this country. By unfettered access to U.S. markets everything would be well again.

• (1855)

The Prime Minister of today said: "Please forgive me because when I ran in 1984 and promised jobs, jobs, jobs I really did not know how to provide them. However now the panacea is going to be the free trade deal with the United States".

I fought hard against that deal almost five years ago because I am a free trader and I believe that the deal that had been negotiated by the Prime Minister and the Prime Minister's cabinet was a bad deal for Canada. I believe that that deal did not have the safety nets in it necessary to allow Canadian industry to develop and prosper so that the best interests of the people of Canada would be looked after.

Lo and behold, almost five years later what do we have? We have our manufacturing sector in Canada, primarily in southern Ontario, the economic engine of this country, laid to waste. There has been an economic disaster in the manufacturing sector with more than 400,000 jobs lost in that sector alone.

So much for free trade. I think if the Canadian public could have a go at it again and roll back to that great debate there would be no question of the outcome and there would be no question as to the survivability of that particular deal.

Shortly after getting elected as a member from Atlantic Canada—from Dartmouth—I came to this place to try to represent the best interests of the people in my riding, region and nation as a whole. One of the underlying foundations of this country has been a belief—our country was founded on this—that everybody in this country, no matter where they live, should have a reason to expect that they can share in the collective wealth of this country.

Successive governments since Confederation have worked toward that particular underlying principle of nationhood. What we have done over and over again was to say that it did not matter if one lived in Saskatchewan during the dirty 1930s, it did not matter if one was in the dust bowl during the times of drought and it did not matter if one was in Atlantic Canada or northern

Ontario when the economy went down. The Government of Canada has a fundamental responsibility to interfere if necessary in the free flow of capital and goods and money in this country to equalize opportunity.

That is why we are different than the United States. It is because we believe fundamentally that that is our right and indeed the requirement of governments.

We have a thing called regional development in this country and it has not always worked. I agree with that. Some of the programs that we have put in place to try to deliver the policy of regional development have been absolute disasters.

However starting in about 1987 we saw this government beginning to move away from a commitment to regional development. It basically said that if it did not make absolute economic sense today then it would withdraw from it. In the first budget after this bunch got back in in 1988 the government started to retrench from its commitment to regional development.

We used to have economic regional development agreements. They were called ERDAs. They were agreements between the federal Government of Canada and the provincial governments for very special cost-sharing programs to develop the silviculture industry in a place like Nova Scotia, mineral exploration and development agreements and fisheries development agreements. These are types of things that will create wealth and employment opportunity in our regions.

These were programs that were negotiated between the two levels of government to try to ensure that the necessity of equalizing opportunity in this country took place. However between 1984 and 1989-90 this government refused to renegotiate $1.44 billion in regional development agreements with places like Newfoundland—before the fishery was destroyed—or Nova Scotia or Prince Edward Island. It removed $1.44 billion from an economy of only 2.4 million people. Yet it said it was committed to regional development.

I was the ACOA critic. My colleague from Central Nova on the front benches opposite was the minister. I have no doubt in my mind that his effort was in earnest and his intention was honest in trying at that cabinet table to promote the real interests of Atlantic Canadians.

• (1900)

However, he presided over drastic cuts to the ACOA budget. With ACOA there was great fanfare and $1.05 billion. It was going to replace the other regional development programs that had been in place. But we saw in its first two budgets that this government cut back the money and stretched it out by an extra two years.

An hon. member: Reprofiled.

Mr. MacDonald (Dartmouth): It reprofiled, as the minister said. Somebody in this House suggested that the minister should be reprofiled himself for his lack of ability to protect the interests of Atlantic Canadians.

Take the port of Halifax. Dartmouth is on the shores—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): I am sorry, but it being 7 o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 30(6), the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business, as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

THE ENVIRONMENT

RIGHT TO SUE GOVERNMENT INSTITUTIONS FOR VIOLATIONS

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider establishing the public right to sue government institutions for failure to protect the environment.

He said: Mr. Speaker, on four occasions this week I have given speeches and on leaving the Chamber I had my hand shaken as members said: "That was a great speech. It is good to see you go, pal".

I am reasonably certain that this is my last speech, this being the last order of business. I am honoured to have the opportunity to move the last motion to be debated in this 34th Parliament particularly as it concerns an area and a topic very close to my heart. That is protecting the environment.

The motion to establish the public right to sue government institutions for failure to protect the environment is something we have long needed. I will demonstrate in the next 20 minutes why the House should, as soon as it

resumes sitting, pass legislation in order to have this occur.

The intent is to protect and conserve the ecological systems of Canada, obviously not all of them entirely intact in their wilderness state, but certainly to maintain them in an ecologically functioning state. This is something we know is not occurring with the contamination of the Great Lakes, the St. Lawrence, the Fraser River and most of the fresh water systems in Canada. There is contamination even into the Arctic, into the polar bear populations and so on.

Only those in this House needing remedial education would fail to realize that we are on the brink of a precipice. We must turn away from the kind of institutional operation I have seen here for more than 14 years and that we see throughout the whole of this country and around the world.

The principle that would be invoked by this opportunity to sue government institutions for failure to protect the environment is that it would promote environmentally sound decision making. That is something one does not find in government departments or on the floor of this House.

It would facilitate meaningful public involvement, something that does not occur in this country. We do not have the well-funded and well-integrated environmental organizations and foundations that the United States and other countries have. Our environmental organizations are small. They are poorly funded and are certainly excluded from the political and institutional decision making.

It will provide for government accountability, something which there is little if any of at the moment. It will protect intact every ecosystem in Canada through the development of an environmental registry. I recall recently a witness before a committee said that if you have a dream and you have a timetable, then you have a plan.

With this motion I am suggesting the dream of a protected ecosystem for the whole planet. A timetable was attempted to be put in place at the world summit in Rio a year ago. Regrettably that was not adopted by the major developing or developed countries in this world. We have to hope that at least Rio triggered a new political awakening. It certainly has not triggered a new environmental consciousness as yet.

This proposal would trigger reviews. It would give the public the opportunity to get involved. It would trigger investigations. It would provide a trigger for public prosecutions. Most particularly, it would provide for access to the courts and the potential for not only the polluter to pay, but for the regulator and the enforcer to pay. Of course it is the government itself that is responsible for most of the lax regulation and lax enforcement and the destruction of our environment.

• (1905)

Before carrying on with the specifics of this motion, I would like to take a moment to thank the many people in my constituency for sending me here and for helping me here and in the constituency. They know who they are and I am grateful. I also thank my staff here in the House of Commons and in the constituency for the endless hours of diligent support they have provided to me.

For my education in politics and in life skills I thank my father Blair and mother Margaret who live in Vancouver and put up with a wild and almost always thankless son. Their support has been total and that has made me a proud son.

For putting up with the endless hours of travel, late nights and stress, I thank my wife Elizabeth. She has borne the brunt of this job and has borne two wonderful children along the way, our son Blair who is now 11 and our daughter Katie who is 9. I plan in the years ahead to make up for the parenting they have missed in the busy parliamentary years since 1979.

It is for the love of family, friends, constituency, this great country and this wonderful planet that I have served and I am proud for having done so.

This motion is an attempt to put in perspective a monitoring process for government institutions to provide for the enforcement of laws and regulations that have been passed by legislatures of this country and to speed a new process.

There is significant non-compliance with regulations and laws to protect the environment and this is epidemic in Canada. I recall only two years ago in British Columbia that in some areas of the province more than 80 per cent of certain types of waste disposal and waste discharge permits had been in significant non-compliance

by large industry for more than a year. Giant corporations like the Alcan Corporation were simply flouting the law. Any fines they would get were simply considered to be the cost of doing business. That is no way for Canada's environment to survive.

Let me give another example right in the backyard of Parliament. A company by the name of Tioxide has just closed, one of the worst toxic contaminators of the entire St. Lawrence system. Over the last 10 years its operations in Europe have been under intense scrutiny and regulation by the governments in Europe. It has recently been given environmental awards for being so environmentally appropriate. Here in Canada because of significant non-compliance, lax enforcement and weak-willed politicians it remained one of the worst polluters in Canada. When it was actually told to start cleaning up even a little bit, it simply shut its doors, gave the flying fickle finger of fate to Canada and moved its operations offshore.

That will continue to happen if we go the route of the North American free trade agreement, which my friend from Kamloops touched upon. Environmental standards will go to the lowest common denominator on the continent if that piece of legislation regrettably gets through in a majority Liberal or Conservative government coming to power later in 1993. The North American free trade agreement stands as the largest single danger that has ever been considered to the environment of North America.

Overwhelmingly Liberals and Conservatives are opposed to full cost accounting and in fact I must say many New Democrats are as well, principally as a result of misinformation within society generally.

Let us look at the integrated vertical ownership and structure of the media in this country which is in the hands of people like Conrad Black. Noam Chomsky has been mentioning this for years in his books, such as *Manufacturing Consent*. If we allow the private sector with certain vested interests to take raw resources and to use the environment simply as a waste disposal area and to sacrifice labour and if those same integrated economic interests control radio, television, newspapers and magazines, one does not have to be a rocket scientist to realize that the likelihood of having an educated population able to fight for their own rights and able to protect the environment is close to zero.

I regret to say that in the 14 years I have been here I have seen a continual and dismal decline in the coverage of environmental issues in this country by what is described as the mainstream media.

That includes the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation where since it was taken over by the Progressive Conservative Party as a mini Senate the control of the media is obvious to anyone who wants to look. It is not the issues and how they cover them, it is the issues that are chosen to be covered which is where the CBC management, the Tory management, managed to manipulate Canadians into thinking that everything is nice and warm and okay when it comes to the environment.

• (1910)

Regrettably it is only when there are disasters and catastrophes that we get a response from this House. There has to be a *Nestucca* spill or an *Exxon Valdez* or a tire fire before governments leap to action and enforcement agencies start to lay the plethora of charges they have at their fingertips.

Our environment continues to decline because those who believe that the institutional approach we are taking is working are those who believe that the solution to pollution is dilution which is the ultimate ironic lie. Those who believe that resources are solely for exploitation and not for protection and conservation are of a similar mindset. They are the same people who believe that the externalization of waste is of no cost or concern. Their eyes are only drawn to the balance sheet and the balance sheet of the world is already demonstrating as we know.

Just today while we give these speeches to close the House for this 34th Parliament, 40,000 children on this planet will die of preventable disease. Yet there is so little being done in this country to deal with that or many of the other crises that the planet faces. Naturally the environment will decline into the foreseeable future while Canadians are offered the existing political system in its unbalanced form as their only option based on go-for-it policies, election after election.

We heard a moment ago from a member from Alberta who said how great it is that the New Democrats have been wiped out in Alberta and Mr. Klein is now the

premier of Alberta. I was born in Alberta and regret to see what has happened there. One need only look at the rate of increase in the debt and the rate of exploitation of resources in that province to know that those who voted Tory again and elected a majority Tory government are opting for more of the same policies. There will be more of the gouging, destruction, abuse and over-exploitation of the Alberta environment for the now generation, never thinking of the future generations and that incredible environment that is being destroyed and pulped up for foreign benefit, foreign profit and to increase the debt of those who are now being born in Alberta.

Let us think for example of another area where litigation would help if my motion was put into law. In 1987 the Prime Minister of this country and President Reagan of the United States signed into law a binding accord in terms of the Great Lakes that there would be zero tolerance and zero discharge of toxins into the Great Lakes. Here we are six years later and on every single day in every single year the amount of toxins going in has continued. The level of enforcement has been zero. That is the only zero that has come in this equation. The Love Canal is still there, the toxins are still pouring in from the U.S. side of the Niagara escarpment and the toxins have continued to pour through the St. Clair and other Canadian systems into the Great Lakes.

If we start to give some kinds of tools and powers back to the Canadian public and the people of this world to hold institutions accountable on a daily basis, we can go back to what we require which is full cost accounting. We need to know the real cost, not just of taking water out of a river. When Alcan takes all but 14 per cent of the water out of the Nechako, we need to know not just what the effect of taking that water out will be in running it down the Kemano River. We also need to know the full cost impact. What is the impact down the Fraser system? What is the impact on the Fraser River estuary, the Gulf of Georgia, the microclimates on the way down the Fraser? If we lower Hell's Gate by three feet by giving Alcan the power it wants to sell and export, what are the impacts on cattlemen who live along the plateau along the Fraser who want to pump water to feed their stock?

• (1915)

What are all the impacts on other future potential developments? Without full cost accounting those on the inside track are the only beneficiaries. Future generations and entire ecosystems are the losers.

The public must be given the right to sue government institutions that fail to protect the environment. Political decisions must carry time, space and reality-measured price tags and at the moment they do not carry any of those.

As I leave this institution I can comment as someone who has worked hard in committee and on the floor of the House. I can say that the institution itself is out of step and direction with sustainable development. Maurice Strong, the chair of the world summit on environment in Rio was on the radio earlier today and confirmed my observation that we continue to hurtle institutionally toward extinction as though we did not know it.

This institution is not operating on full cost accounting and when I speak of the institution I do not speak solely of the institution of Parliament. I speak of all parts of the federal government, the provincial governments and the territorial governments responsible for the public interest. These institutions are not operating on full cost accounting nor is any legislature at the moment on earth, but there is no excuse for continuing on the road to an uninhabitable earth.

I am deeply grateful to my father Blair for educating me about real life and teaching me to understand that real politics is the politics of sharing and caring for all that is about us: people as well as birds, wildlife, clean water and clear mountain air. They have passed the torch to me and although I have made many friends here and both won and lost many major battles, I regret to report to them, my family, my constituents and all Canadians that we are losing the ecological gifts we inherited from time immemorial.

Our environment is a living universal memory and wilderness is our window back to the universe. We diminish ourselves when we diminish the natural world. As the list of endangered species of plants and animals grows in Canada and across the planet we must ask how we can stop this.

Parks and conservation are merely holdout pockets. It is a new way of politics and thinking that we need. We know the causes of our problems and we know some of the effects but what about simple things such as global warming? It is the butt of jokes on most late night talk shows on television in the winter time, whether it is someone from Chicago saying: "I wish that global warming was here" or someone in the Canadian north saying "I wish we had more global warming this winter".

I sat for several years on a committee in this House and spent almost $1 million of public money looking into the issue of global warming. Our committee composed of Conservatives, Liberals and New Democrats came to a unanimous conclusion that global warming poses a greater threat to the people of Canada and the people of the world than anything other than all out nuclear war.

What has this 34th Parliament of Canada under our eighteenth Prime Minister done? We had a promise that greenhouse gases would be stabilized at 1990 levels by the year 2000. That promise was made two years ago and the studies are now in. Some of them are hidden by Energy, Mines and Resources but some have trickled their way into the public. It is now expected that we will be 13 per cent above 1990 levels by the year 2000.

This is a government response. This is an institutional response without a peep from most members of Parliament. It is a threat that is second only to all out nuclear war and we are doing nothing. The Pacific Ocean where I live has already started to rise and no one seems to care about it.

I leave one germinal idea, one seminal idea as one of the last speakers in this Parliament to speak on a motion. I hope the next Parliament takes the environment far more seriously than this one did and actually does something about the big issues such as global warming, ozone depletion and massive deforestation that are now starting to affect not only my province but other areas of the country. I hesitate to sound too negative or unhappy but I must reflect about how this institution could change for my constituents and Canadians in these last moments I have.

• (1920)

My first suggestion was to give Canadians the tools and the opportunity to sue government institutions that fail to protect the environment because they are the regulators. Too many times in my life as a politician I have seen the Department of Fisheries and Oceans fail to prosecute themselves, fail to enforce and uphold regulations and statutes passed by this place.

Certainly we can continue to have the benches here and continue to elect people from constituencies, but if we fail to become more organic and more in touch with what is going on in the world around us there will not be a world.

People like David Suzuki and others who say this is the turn around decade are not fools. The scientists we all listened to in Rio are not fools. It is the unanimous opinion of the most senior scientists on this planet that we must turn around this decade and make a change to full cost accounting and sustainable development.

In closing I thank the pages and the staff of the House. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary library, the security staff and all those who have worked in this place in the years that I have been here, and in particular the Table who I have harassed many times over the years on matters sometimes trifling and sometimes not. It has been an honour to have worked here.

I wish those who are re-elected here and those who still serve the very best. They deserve luck.

Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan): Mr. Speaker, I rise not to speak on the motion but to say a few words about the mover of the motion.

Today has been a day of tributes to many members. The member for Skeena will not be re-offering, as they say out east, but has chosen to move on with his life. I want to say a few words on behalf of my caucus and Canadians about Jim Fulton.

We have clearly heard in the last couple of minutes his passion for the environment. There is no question about his commitment to making this country and this planet a place that will survive. But he has also fought hard for justice for the aboriginal peoples. He has fought hard for Canada to keep it Canada. He has been involved for many, many years with the Canadian-U.S. parliamentary association. He has taken the issues into the United

States or brought American legislators into Canada to talk about the issues that affect us on both sides of the border. I can remember a number of times when he said 54:40 or fight in caucus. He had a passion for matters that affected us.

I want to say thanks to Jim Fulton on behalf of Canadians, on behalf of this House and on behalf of the NDP caucus. I also want to say thanks to Liz and the kids for loaning Jim to us for awhile. There are a few of us who recognize that there is a time to move on and get back into the family which Jim has done. He has made the decision that he wants to spend some time with his kids while they are still kids and while he can still know them.

Mr. Speaker, if I can say through you to Liz and the kids, we want him back after awhile. We want him to seek a new mandate four years from now or eight years from now because he has a lot of intelligence, a lot of knowledge and a lot of heart which is part of what makes this place work so well and part of what makes this country so great.

I am pleased to be able to say that Jim Fulton is a friend, although quite frankly as Whip of my caucus there were times when he has driven me not just to distraction but beyond it. In fact I am told that a previous Whip actually had to call Air Canada to prevent Jim Fulton from getting on a plane one day when he was supposed to be back here for a vote. I have never had to take those steps although I have grabbed him by the ear or the scruff of the neck to say: "Jimmy, what are you up to?" But he is a friend and we are all going to miss him and we all say thanks.

Mr. Larry Schneider (Regina—Wascana): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to this private member's motion, but before I do that I want to pay tribute in perhaps a different kind of way or maybe the same way, to the same member. With respect to the statement that was just made inviting him to come back I would just as soon invite him to stay home thank you very much because he was a very formidable opponent.

• (1925)

I distinctly recall one evening when we had the opportunity to debate one another. We then met in our lobby. I will not say in very much detail what was said but whatever was said caused us both to smile, to understand one another, to acknowledge one another and to form a bit of bond at that particular time. I do share an appreciation for the contribution that the member for Skeena has made.

When the member from Skeena was talking about his two children it reminded me as well of my own family situation. I was the mayor of the capital city of Saskatchewan for nine years. I saw three children born in my house but with the pressures of that particular elected job I was not able to grow with them in spite of the fact I was home practically every night.

In that way I can relate to not only his problem but to the problem of every member of Parliament who has children and people they are close to at home. They spend some pretty ridiculous hours that the public is not aware of. They may view this Chamber through the eye of television periodically and see some of the chairs busy. They want to know how come I was not in the House of Commons at a particular time. I have to take the time to explain to them all the committees that members sit on and how busy they are.

It certainly is a void in terms of the public understanding the efforts that members of Parliament go through. I want to again acknowledge the hon. member for Skeena. I want to say that I appreciate the love and affection his family has obviously given him so that he can be the formidable opponent that he is.

I have another task as well while I am on my feet. Unfortunately that is to speak to this private member's motion because I would like to speak about the contribution that members of Parliament make to this great place. I must speak to the motion to express some concerns.

As we have heard earlier the hon. member for Skeena has provided us with a private member's motion that calls upon the government to consider establishing the public right to sue government institutions for failure to protect the environment.

On its face I think that all members can share the underlying concern that is expressed in this motion. We can and do agree that the law has to be marshalled to support and enhance environmental protection not only in Canada but everywhere. We can and we do further agree that the law as it stands can be improved and should be supplemented where it is inadequate.

Certainly where the environment is concerned governments have a leading role to play in a partnership with a corporate world and the public as a whole. What does this motion precisely propose? Although the exact wording is a little confusing I think it seeks legislation that would do two things. In the first place it would create some kind of positive obligation on the part of every unit of government, department, agency, branch or what have you to ensure that its decisions or actions do not produce harmful environmental effects.

Second, the motion would give standing to any member of the public to sue the responsible government body where any such governmental act, decision or omission had occurred resulting in a harmful environmental effect.

These are quite radical proposals which must be carefully looked at even if the ultimate goal they seek to achieve is unquestionably admirable. I suggest that there are major problems with this proposal. In the first place there was an absolutist ideology attached to the hon. member's motion that any activity or omission on the part of the Crown resulting in a failure to protect the environment would be actionable.

What exactly would that include? Would it include a decision by the Minister of Communications under the Radiocommunication Act to issue a technical certificate allowing a company to set up a television transmitter in a specific location where it would entail chopping down a few trees? What if those trees are on the company's own property? What if the trees were dead and needed to be cut down anyway? Are we heading off in the direction of turning a governmental failure to protect the environment into some kind of tort. If so what is the duty of care on the part of the Crown here and what standard of care is to be applied?

One thing I am afraid of is that if this motion is given effect it would take Crown liability way beyond what it is today and make virtually any decision of a government body vulnerable to a civil action.

Over the last 10 or 15 years the courts have struggled with just such a question pertaining to the exercise of public functions mostly at the municipal level.

• (1930)

In their wisdom the courts have distinguished between policy decisions on one hand and operational decisions on the other. The importance of this distinction lies in the fact that the courts have consistently refused to attach liability to the policy decisions. Among other things, government bodies are required to make choices as to public priorities, how the hierarchy of public policy interest is to be arrayed, how public money is to be spent or how scarce resources are to be allocated.

These questions are the essence of government. These are what we elect politicians to decide on. They are beyond the reach of the courts which is the way I believe it should be.

I mention this because I am fearful that in its fervour to enhance environmental protection the end result of this motion will be to paralyze governmental bodies in terms of performing their functions and fulfilling their mandates.

Speaking of mandates, I think that the hon. member simply does not realize that one effect of his motion will be to force environmental protection, whatever that means, to be written into the mandate of every functioning federal entity. Legally this will be necessary if environmental considerations are to become a valid and enforceable concern of the Minister of Communications or the CRTC or the Merchant Seamen Compensation Board or the Civil Aviation Tribunal and so on.

The motion further raises some constitutional concerns which I am afraid need to be addressed. Our Constitution Act does not assign environmental protection exclusively, either to the federal government in criminal law or banking or navigation and shipping for example, or to the provinces. Environmental protection is a shared responsibility between both levels of government. One obvious implication of this is the absolute necessity of extensive co-operation and consultation between the federal government and the provinces in this field.

I would therefore suggest that it would not be appropriate for either level of government to introduce radical changes in the law pertaining to the environment and environmental protection without prior discussion and consultation.

I could exhaust all my time simply cataloguing what I see as serious legal problems posed by this motion. However as a general comment I would suggest that the absolutist view underlying this motion categorically rules out any legitimate competing value or interest which the government has to consider in all matters, including matters affecting the environment.

I am talking about such things as sustainable development, economic growth and competitiveness which are important aspects of public policy. These are matters that simply cannot be swept aside or ignored in the real world.

Environmental protection is a noble cause within the framework of the balancing of many different public policy goals. I am sure my hon. friend knows this but he appears to have momentarily forgotten this in putting his motion forward in its present form.

I should say that there are aspects of this motion that I like in principle. For example I am not in principle against empowering individuals with private rights that they can assert against the Crown and the courts. I do not think that the Crown should be given immunity that would shield it from civil liability in relation to conduct that is damaging to individuals. The hon. member surely knows that both common law and civil law already allow private resources against the party responsible for a spill or other environmental event producing actual injury or damage to property or other private interest.

This can include government bodies where they are actually responsible for a spill or other environmental tort. It is not in my view good legal policy to use private remedies to enforce public interests such as environmental protection which is exactly what this motion appears to propose.

At whose cost will these private remedies be asserted? Does the hon. member think that individuals are going to be willing to bear the costs of litigation in suing government bodies for torts before the courts if his motion is turned into law?

Is there an assumption that some kind of government program would fund court challenges? Although nothing is mentioned about this, I suspect that such a program is part of this deal. If we can sort out the implicit question of funding, what nature of lawsuit does the hon. member have in mind in empowering individuals to sue the actions, damages and injunctions et cetera of government bodies?

Perhaps a better legal approach in this area lies in strengthening and where appropriate expanding the licensing and regulatory mechanisms for environmental protection which place a positive obligation on both the governments and the public. This is backed by enforceable legal recourse including penal sanctions.

To sum up, the motion while admirable and objective is flawed in design. Although all of us are desirous of creating a legal environment that puts environmental protection up there at the top it behooves us not to fall prey to solutions such as just simply suing the government which is what is being proposed here. They look good on paper and from a distance but when more closely examined they are not solutions at all.

• (1935)

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops): Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to rise to speak in favour of Motion No. 323 presented in the name of the hon. member for Skeena:

> That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider establishing the public right to sue government institutions for failure to protect the environment.

In a sense this is a litmus test of whether or not the government believes in environmental protection. This is the test that my hon. friend from Skeena has put forward to see whether or not the government actually believes in ensuring that environmental issues are kept front and foremost in the years ahead.

I find it is interesting that my friends on the government side have said that they cannot support this motion. There is the government support of the James Bay project and all of the environmental holocaust that will result in that type of development. There was its support of Hibernia where oil wells are set out in the stream of icebergs floating south. There was the Oldman River dam project, the various diversion projects on the prairies, the diversion of the Nechako River and Kemano II.

If there has been a single individual who has stood up time and time again to represent the environment of Canada, it has been the hon. member for Skeena. The member and his colleagues have been relentless in their

support of ecological and environmental issues that have been presented to this House.

I say with some disappointment that time and time again this government has said that the environment is not a priority. I say that with a great deal of discouragement because the most recent example was with Kemano II where a secret deal was cut behind closed doors between the previous provincial government and the federal government. It said that while the project called Kemano II was to divert up to 80 per cent of the flow of the Nechako River, one of the major tributaries of the Fraser River system, there would be no requirement for any environmental assessment of that project. This deal was secretly cut behind closed doors. Today we find out that this was done to divert 80 per cent of a major river's flow without any examination of what that meant in terms of environmental or ecological consequences.

I want to say that the hon. member for Skeena has demonstrated a profound dedication to the environment and its preservation for future generations. I remember very well back in June 1992 when the hon. member for Skeena brought forward a motion that would set aside 12 per cent of Canada for parkland development. As a result of his incredible ability as an individual to negotiate with the Minister of the Environment and the environmental critic of the Official Opposition we received unanimous consent for that motion to go forward.

This was, as indicated by a number of American writers and environmentalists, one of the biggest and largest real estate deals in Canadian history. It was to set aside 12 per cent of Canada's land surface for parks so future generations could enjoy that pristine environment. The people of Canada will be forever indebted to my hon. colleague from Skeena. As an individual he has an understanding of ecological and environmental issues second to no one.

I think that all members of the House would agree—I know my friends opposite as well as my friends in Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition would agree—that if there is an individual who has demonstrated over the years not only a profound knowledge and understanding but an insight into ecological and environmental issues then it was the member for Skeena. Time and time again he captivated not only the House of Commons but the Parliament of Canada and indeed the people of Canada in terms of drawing their attention on critical environmental issues, whether it was acid rain or the ozone issue. I guess it culminated in the creation of the South Moresby Park.

• (1940)

There are all sorts of reasons why this miracle occurred, why a major ecological area of the west coast of Canada was set aside as a park. There are many players in this process. One of the critical players was my hon. colleague from Skeena who was able to stick-handle a very complicated and complex issue into reality. Future generations will be forever grateful to him.

The hon. member for Skeena has demonstrated a commitment to protect and conserve the pristine environments of our country and indeed has demonstrated a profound duty to stand up for not only this generation but for generations to come to ensure that people of the future in our country will have an opportunity to benefit from our pristine environment.

I enthusiastically support this motion. I think the passage of this motion would demonstrate that the government would say: "Yes, we are serious about environmental issues. Yes, we want to provide the public the right to sue government institutions if they fail to protect the environment". Who could vote against this? Who would want to say that conscientious citizens ought not to have the right to sue the government if it acts in ways and means against the environment or if it takes steps that will result in the denigration of our ecological systems?

I am assuming this is going to pass. In closing I want to say that the hon. member for Skeena who lives in a log structure on the Queen Charlotte Islands on the west coast of Canada has demonstrated through his entire lifetime a commitment to the environment and the ecology of the country. He has demonstrated a profound appreciation and understanding of these complex environmental issues that escape others. He has always had the support of his wife Liz and his children, Blair and Katie. He has always demonstrated that he is prepared to go to whatever degree is necessary to represent not only his constituents in the great riding of Skeena, but to represent all Canadians on some of the critical environmental issues confronting us.

We all remember the many examples during the international conferences, particularly between Canada and the United States, where the member for Skeena led the discussions on critical environmental issues overlapping our borders with the United States, whether they be the 49th parallel or the border between Alaska and British Columbia and the rest of Canada.

We are going to miss Jim Fulton. However, we are comforted in the knowledge that he is going to go forward and maintain his commitment to environmental issues. We wish him well in his endeavours to assist others, be they governments of whatever level, be they individuals, organizations and agencies in their pursuit of ensuring that future generations are able to benefit from the pristine environments that still exist within our great country.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): There being no further members rising for debate, the time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired.

Pursuant to Standing Order 96(1), the order is dropped from the Order Paper.

According to the order adopted earlier, we will resume the adjournment debate. The hon. member for Dartmouth has 12 minutes remaining.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

MOTION TO ADJOURN

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Andre (p. 20927).

Mr. Ron MacDonald (Dartmouth): Mr. Speaker, I was talking about this government's record over the last five years. It has been an abysmal record. It has been a record of absolute despair. It has been a record of misleading Canadians about the true intentions of the government's economic agenda.

Before we rose I was talking about the port of Halifax. This port is one of the probably two most efficient ports in all of North America. It has suffered under the regressive taxation, depreciation and rail policies of this government.

• (1945)

Continuously I have risen to my feet in this place and asked the Prime Minister, the Minister of Transport, or anybody opposite who cared, to please address the real concerns that have been raised by the people like those in the Halifax–Dartmouth Port Development Commission, the Atlantic Provinces Transportation Council, about the very policies that were driving Canadian-bound container traffic away from the port of Halifax and down to the ports of New York and Baltimore.

The tonnage, the container traffic, and the jobs were driven away because of those policies. I have been on my feet in this House 30 times, the most recent time being yesterday, asking for help for the port of Halifax. The Minister of Transport does not care at all about the important position of the port of Halifax and has absolutely refused in five years to respond to one of the requests that have been put forward, not by me because maybe I am a partisan, but by the people whose business it is to promote the port of Halifax and preserve the level of traffic that was there formerly.

The stevedores are not working. The people have lost their jobs at the grain terminal in Halifax because this government in another one of its brilliant moves, came in and cancelled the At and East program which subsidized the movement of grain through Atlantic Canadian ports. What about all the people who lost their jobs at that grain terminal when the government came in and indiscriminately cut that subsidy, but never touched the Crow rate, never touched any subsidization through western grain stabilization. Oh no, no. Every time there has been a cut by this government, it has disproportionately put the burden of that hardship on to Atlantic Canada. So the port has suffered under this administration.

I spoke a little earlier about the requirement for this country to grow and prosper and the redistribution of wealth. I talked about things like ACOA and economic regional development agreements which have been gutted, neutered by this government's policies over the last five years.

Another way that governments try to transfer money to equalize opportunity is by Established Program Financing. I have said over and over again here in this House and all across this country that what this government has done in its attempt to withdraw the historic

commitment to regional development is that it has jiggled the books, it has cooked the figures.

What it has done with transfers to provinces through Established Program Financing is change the formula. EPF is there to transfer funds for things like health care so that it does not matter if one is in Newfoundland or British Columbia or Alberta or Nova Scotia, one will have the same access to quality health care whether in a have or have not province. We believe as Canadians that they were some of the basic things, the glue that held this country together.

What has the government done by changing the formula by which it determined what amount of costs are shared? In 1992 alone in the province of Nova Scotia it has decreased the level of funding for hospitals by $111 million.

We have a program for post-secondary education that transfers funds to equalize opportunities so it does not matter where one lives in this great nation, the province will be able to afford quality post-secondary education. The Tories jiggle the formula.

Nova Scotia in 1992 received $46 million less. My God man, we are a province of only 900,000 people. We have a diminishing tax base. The bunch opposite have destroyed our fisheries. They have caused a recession to take place that has left the province of Nova Scotia with the highest levels of bankruptcies in its history.

In 1991, because of this government's economic policies, in the province of Nova Scotia we had one business or personal bankruptcy for every 305 men, women and children.

The government has laid waste to the promise of resource based industries in Atlantic Canada. Yet every time it is raised here, ministers get up and deny, deny, deny and tell everybody that things are going to be much better.

• (1950)

Unemployment, think about it. Five long years ago this government fooled the people. It got elected by saying it was going to address the real problem in this country. It was going to put people back to work. Tell that to the people who live in North Preston in my riding. Tell it to the people who live in Eastern Passage. Tell it to the people who live in Cape Breton and Newfoundland where unemployment rates are as high as 40 per cent.

Tell them how much better this government's policies have been. Tell them the country is better off at the end of this Parliament than when it began. They will say that the last five years of government in this Parliament have been five solid years of despair, extinguishing the hope of every Canadian that tomorrow will be a better day.

There are university students in my area whose fathers and mothers have never been laid off. Those parents now have no jobs. The little nest egg that was put away for a rainy day is gone. The students cannot go to university. Tuitions have gone through the roof because of federal government economic policies.

What does the government do? Does the government come in with programs to put Canadians back to work? Does the government address the underlying problems in the economy caused by its own policies? No. On at least three occasions the government has come in and attacked the unemployed, not unemployment. It has come in and said: "If you do not have a job, that is your problem, Jack. You must be trying to rip off the system".

The most recent changes that the government tried to pass were changes that would have seen the amount of benefit decreased and the length of time one could collect decreased in the middle of the worst recession we have ever had. However, the amount of weeks that one needs to qualify for unemployment insurance increased.

In short, what the government has done is it has made the poorest of the poor and the most disadvantaged in this country pay for the folly of its economic policies.

We have seen the national debt go through the roof. This bunch opposite just cannot count. The Tories down in my riding will probably have somebody run who will say: "Give us one more chance. We will do it right this time. We know how to control the debt". If anybody in my riding was off in projecting their household budgets as many times as these guys opposite were they would be on the bankruptcy rolls. That is what would happen.

The national debt is a disgrace. But what is even more disgraceful is that the government has absolutely refused after four and a half years of despair inflicted upon Canadians to go back to the people to give the people

the final right to have a say here. It has refused to call an election.

We have had some other issues as well. We have had the drug prices. We know the government's agenda is big business. It certainly is not the people in my riding. The government has come in and said: "Hey, we are going to get rid of compulsory licensing for drugs".

What does that mean to the average Canadian? It means that cheaper generic drugs will not be available to them. For the average senior citizen living in the province of Nova Scotia it means that the pharmacare program is less universally accessible because the costs have gone through the roof. But the government says: "Hey, this is good government".

We have talked about the fishery, not at length but we have talked a bit about the fishery. The Atlantic fishery is the reason this country was populated in the first place. The Europeans came in search of fish, in search of cod. For centuries now that cod stock has sustained not just the few people who live on the east coast of Canada, but it has sustained the nation.

After only a few short years this government has taken a resource that has been resilient, that has been a renewable resource and it has mismanaged it into a complete closure, a complete collapse. Tens of thousands of Atlantic Canadians no longer have pay cheques coming in. Their boats are tied up. They have no future because of this government.

We have had a government over the last few years that has brought this wonderful institution of Parliament into disrepute. The government opposite has constantly abused its majority in this Parliament. Closure or time allocation has been used 45 times which is probably more times than closure or time allocation has been used in the previous 100 years.

• (1955)

Each and every time an agenda item came forward in this place on which the government did not want real debate it took my right away to speak to it. More important, it took the away the right of Canadians to have their elected representatives speak on their behalf.

Then there is the big one which nobody will ever forgive or forget: its taxation policies. In the last number of years we have seen increased or new taxes 40 times, billions of dollars coming in. None was more despised than the hated goods and services tax, which has caused a large segment of our industry to go underground.

In conclusion history may not judge this Parliament well. History will probably judge this Parliament to be a Parliament that broke the spirit of the Canadian public. However Canadians will have the final say and the Canadian people will be able to judge between the major parties in Canada and perhaps once again have some hope after the next general election in this country.

Mr. Lee Clark (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, these will presumably be my last words to the House of Commons, on the assumption that we will not be returning prior to the next election.

I am one of those many members who have chosen not to run again. I must confess as I approach what will probably be the last moment of my parliamentary career that I do so with a great deal of nostalgia and considerable sadness.

I am very proud to be a member of the House of Commons. The last 10 years have not always been easy and sometimes they have been very difficult. They have been difficult because we as a government have chosen to tackle some very difficult issues and because of the considerable amount of cynicism which exists within the public toward politicians.

I must confess I very much regret the presence of the latter and hope that future Parliaments will be able to address that and reduce the amount of cynicism which exists. I fear the end result will be the discouragement of many people who should be seeking public office from doing so. Quite frankly, I worry about that.

I hold each of my colleagues in very high regard. I spent most of my life studying political history so I felt when I came to Parliament that I was reasonably well prepared for what I would find here.

One of my pleasant surprises was to discover that the average member of Parliament, almost invariably every member of Parliament, works much harder than I had anticipated, gives more to his or her country than I had anticipated and makes greater sacrifices than I had ever understood. I come away with nothing but respect for those who have served in this Parliament and in the past.

I am sure I will hold those who serve in the future in equally high regard.

On this occasion it is appropriate that I thank the constituents of Brandon—Souris who elected me in 1983 in a by-election called upon the death of the Hon. Walter Dinsdale and subsequently re-elected me in 1984 and 1988. I thank them most sincerely for the honour they bestowed upon me and for the opportunity they gave me to sit in this Chamber and be a part of the government of this land.

I would also like to thank the Prime Minister for the opportunity he gave me to serve as chairman of the Standing Committee on Agriculture and subsequently as parliamentary secretary to several ministers of agriculture and subsequently to ministers of the environment.

Those opportunities were particularly important because they gave me at least a glimpse of the inner workings of government. I leave with a better understanding of the complexities of decision making and the challenges that face those who hold the highest offices in this land.

I would like to thank the many people who have served us well during the course of the last 10 years. I think of those who have occupied your chair, Mr. Speaker, and I commend you and others for the patience you have exhibited on many occasions because we as a Parliament must surely have tested the patience of many Speakers.

In fact my own daughter was here in this House just a couple of days ago and she left shaking her head and saying that they were not allowed to behave like that in school. Mr. Speaker, I dare say that you and other Speakers have regarded us on many occasions as somewhat unruly school children, or worse.

• (2000)

I tried to remind her that this is a debating society and as it is a debating society we have a unique set of rules. Although I suspect we act excessively on occasion generally speaking we serve the nation well.

I would like to take this occasion to thank the table officers and others who serve the House of Commons because there are many. In all cases they have treated me as an individual member of Parliament with the greatest respect. They are too numerous to mention but I want to refer specifically to the security guards who we greet as we enter and leave this Chamber on each and every occasion. In their humour and friendliness they personify what is good about Parliament and Canada. I fear all too often we take the contributions which they and others have made for granted.

I would like to make reference to and thank the pages who have served us during the course of the last 10 years. They are very distinguished young people. All of them are first-year students at Carleton University or the University of Ottawa and they combine a heavy workload here with their first-year studies. As someone who has spent most of my life teaching, I have a great deal of appreciation for the challenge which they have undertaken. They have served us well and I know from my conversations with them that they are also very successful students. Those who have chosen them have chosen well, and I thank them for that.

I would like to make reference to the Whip's office and the staff of the Whip's office who are responsible for having us here when we need to be here, and to the government House leader's office with whom I have had the opportunity to work over the years. I would like to make reference to the staff of the agriculture and environment departments because it was a pleasure to work with those many officials. I would particularly like to thank the ministers I had the opportunity to serve. Without exception they were genuine, committed and sincere Canadians who made me as a parliamentary secretary feel an integral part of their process. That was very important to someone whom I would call a backbencher.

To my colleagues who are seeking re-election, and there are some in the room tonight, I wish them well. I congratulate them on their willingness to continue to serve the nation because as a member who has served for 10 years I understand the sacrifice each of them will make. When I say that I include all members of the House, because I feel one of our deficiencies in this House is an excessive amount of partisanship. I know some of it is not real. Some of it is meant for television and I accept that, but I feel the less partisanship we have the better we are as a House and as parliamentarians.

I would like to make special mention of those who are retiring for a variety of reasons. Quite properly we have paid tribute to some of them in the House. Some of them

have served an extended period of time and some have served in particular capacities. If I remember correctly there are some 60 of us who are retiring. Although I cannot name them as individuals I would like to thank each of them and say that I genuinely believe that they have served their constituents and their nation well. I personally regret that we have not devised a more appropriate way to recognize their contributions because there is a little bit of a hollow feeling as one leaves.

Having said that I do not want to identify them by name, I do want to make one exception. I want to recognize my friend and namesake, the right hon. Joe Clark, who has been such an inspiration to me. It was partly because of his friendship and partly because of his example that I came to the House of Commons in the first place. Curiously, by happenstance we announced our decision to retire on the same day. For some unexplained and curious reason his decision got much more publicity than mine did. I want to say how much he has contributed to this nation. I wish he and all others who are not returning well as they enter into a more private life. Without exception each of those who are doing so have earned the right to that private life.

I would like to mention my own staff. I will not name them but certainly those who have worked with me these last 10 years have served me well. They are the ones who help our constituents the most. They work in our name but without them we could not do the job we do because we cannot be every place, as sometimes we are needed to be. Although very often our staff go unnamed they are the unsung heroes of the place.

• (2005)

Last but certainly not least, I would like to refer to my own family. I think probably those of us who are here would agree without any difference of opinion whatsoever that without the support of our families we would never have been here in the first place and, second, we could not have remained.

I know in the case of my wife, Barbara, she in a very real sense became a single parent as a result of my decision to go into politics. I thought at the time because my children were 18 and 13 that in a very real sense perhaps my role as a parent had ended and I need not worry too much about that. I discovered having gone into politics that that was wrong. I feel in a very real sense that I neglected them, that they paid a certain price for my decision to be a parliamentarian. I apologize publicly to them for the times when I was not present when I wish I could have been present and for the role which I would have wished to have played, but I could not always play.

In a very real sense, I think Canadians are well served by those who serve here, irrespective of party. I only hope in the future that Canadians of all walks of life, of all ages, of both sexes, will be anxious to come to this place because it is a very worthy place to be.

Even though we as individuals may not achieve all of our ambitions because that is usually the way in which life operates, I think those of us who have an opportunity to be here will understand that this is a unique role, this is a unique place. It is a privilege to serve Canada. It is a privilege to be a member of Parliament. I am very grateful for the privileges which have been bestowed upon me.

Mr. Fred J. Mifflin (Bonavista—Trinity—Conception): Mr. Speaker, I would like to start by thanking the hon. member for Brandon—Souris, who was my next door neighbour in the West Block, for a very, very nice presentation. I think he has said totally on a non-partisan basis what each and every one of us would like to have said. Now that he has said it, I guess we do not really need to say it.

I do appreciate his remarks about the friends that we make here, about the sacrifices that our families make and the personal sacrifices that one makes. Yes, it is a voluntary idea to be a member of Parliament and to represent one's constituents in this House of Commons. That does not make it any easier, the fact that we are here. We are all here because we want to be here. We are all here because despite our sacrifices, if you like, and you are included in that as well, Mr. Speaker, we believe we are doing a job for our constituents and for our country. There is no greater feeling of pride and usefulness, despite what the media may say about it and what other opinions may pertain. I am very pleased to be associated with the remarks of my hon. colleague who just spoke who is a very decent and honest person. It has been my pleasure to have been his next-door neighbour.

In the time that I have I am not going to do what I normally do which is essentially to go through the things that I have been concerned about and the things that have affected my riding, my province and Atlantic Canada. I have been as partisan as the rest, I suppose, in the presentations that I have made and during Question Period. I do not have a prepared speech. I thought that if I just stood up here in 15 minutes I would state what really went through my mind, the thoughts that I will remember most in this Parliament.

I have to start with my constituents. I recall my maiden speech. We all remember that rush period before Christmas when we all had to get up and give our speeches and sit down. It was a bit of a nerve-racking experience. I did not get a chance to describe my riding. I do not intend to do it in great detail tonight, but I want to remind the House that I represent the east coast of Newfoundland. When the election results come out, my riding is the first riding to be announced.

The name Bonavista—Trinity—Conception represents the three great bays of Canada on the east coast of Newfoundland, probably the largest fishing area for a riding. I do have the largest fishing riding in commercial fishing in Canada. There is the scenic beauty, the tourist potential, each of the 250 communities and every one of them on the seacoast. Anybody who has been to that part of Newfoundland would have to agree that it is really a beautiful spot. It is a wonderful part of the world.

• (2010)

To balance that, of course, we are going through tough economic times, but I have spoken enough about that in the House. I am sure that my constituents all know that their requirements and their needs and their difficulties have been made known to me in the last four and a half years, and indeed by my other colleagues, so I will not go through that in detail tonight. The record I think speaks for itself.

I will come back to my riding. I want to talk about the pride one has in serving in this House. I can state that while I did not really have political aspirations I used to look up at the Peace Tower in awe and with great pride as a Canadian about what took place here, without really knowing the detail of what took place. Now that I have been through the detail, I suppose, in committee work, visits, trips, partisan discussion, heated debate, ups and downs, joyful times, sad times, difficult times and never easy times, I have an entirely different perspective on the Peace Tower and what takes place in this place.

I am running again, as you know Mr. Speaker, and I hope to be back here again if my constituents agree. I suppose the most moving feeling one has after one term in this House is the tremendous ability and the depth of the individuals who represent their constituents, be it on the government side or the opposition side. I have yet to meet a member of Parliament from any party who has not done his or her best for their constituents. I have not always agreed and quite often not agreed with the philosophy of other members and their way of doing things, but as I have often said to my constituents, I will not criticize any organization for making operational mistakes or for making bad judgments. Occasionally if promises are made that cannot be kept then I will hold anybody to that aspect of either politics or life or anything of that nature.

It is very hard to single out individuals, but there are a couple of cases that I would like to mention which really have been an inspiration, if you like. On my own side, the hon. Leader of the Opposition has always been an inspiration to me. He has had some tough times and he has shown strength. I have great admiration for him and his family and the leadership that he has provided, particularly at this difficult time in the country and with the tough roads ahead.

Also the Whip and House leader, present and past, on my side of the House have had to work very hard to run in opposition. Being in opposition of course is a job that offers certain responsibilities and allows certain actions to take place that one would not experience in government. I have only experienced the opposition side and I say without any smart aleck statements that I am hoping in the next election I will have the opportunity to sit on the government side.

I have come in here some mornings feeling a bit like a hero for arriving early. One feels a bit smug arriving at seven o'clock, sometimes earlier. But I have arrived at seven o'clock in the morning. The hon. member who has just come into this House from Parry Sound—Muskoka whom I have come to know and have great admiration for is not that much older than I am but I think his years on me are somewhat noteworthy. I have arrived early in the morning to see his unmistakable car parked already obvious that he was here before me. I have gone home close to midnight, feeling that having punched in almost an 18-hour day I have been pretty hard done by and I

feel pretty sorry for myself, only to find that that member's car is still there.

• (2015)

That is an inspiration for anybody. Then there are my mates. I mentioned the hon. member for Brandon—Souris and the hon. member for York—Simcoe who I believe is around here this evening and who is my other neighbour.

Both of them are on the government side but that does not prevent us from having a civilized chat about the world in general to compare our difficulties, our successes and failures as members of Parliament. That after all is really what makes life bearable in this place.

We get no sympathy from the outside. I am not saying that we take sympathy from each other. I think that is an aspect without which life would be almost unbearable in the job.

Concerning the same member I have to remember a highlight in this House when we had the Voyageur Canada exchange program. Young Canadians were allowed to exchange experiences with each other. Young members of my constituency from Newfoundland travelled to Newmarket and around Ontario. In some cases it was the first time that they had been away from home. They made new friends and witnessed new experiences. To me it was a great highlight.

It was also a great highlight to have participated along with other members in the Canada 125 unity tournament that took place. I am still in the process of getting a videotape of that for one of the gentlemen in my riding who organized it. I have not promised him that I will get one but I am almost certain I will in the next couple of weeks. It is almost there.

I have been here for a relatively short time. It has been four and one-half years. I have to remember that the Canadian Forces in that time has gone through tremendous turmoil as an organization and as an institution. The business of the cold war which was very much in vogue when we came to this place is now over. The business of defence planning is as tough on the government as it would be for the opposition. We are at a crossroads in history. We are out of the rut of the standard planning, if I could call it that, where we know who the enemy is and what his capabilities are and can guess at his intentions.

We do not have a recognized enemy any more. We cannot look at their capabilities. We cannot figure out their intentions. There is no identified enemy right now. We are in that part of history where we are not quite in whatever is going to take the place of the cold war which is over. It is very much like at the end of World War II. It took about four to five years before the Iron Curtain came down and we got into some kind of a planning groove which kept us going for some 40 years.

I do not know when we are going to reach a point where we will be able to do that planning. It appears that peacekeeping is very much in vogue but it too has had its difficulties and this has caused, in the case of the Canadian forces, certain grief. It has caused the minister grief particularly at a busy time in her life when she was running for the leadership which she won. It was an unfortunate part.

This in no way, shape or form has detracted from the tremendous pride that all Canadians have in their servicemen and servicewomen. The standards that they maintain on the sea on land or in the air and anywhere in between, whether it is regular forces or reserves, is second to none. Their reputation is best judged by other countries. Ask any country. Certainly in NATO and in any part of the western world and indeed in some of the countries behind what used to be the Iron Curtain they will tell you that Canadian professional military people will stack up with any and are better than most if not all.

Nothing that has happened here in Question Period or in debate has meant to detract from the tremendous pride that we have in our men and women in uniform. I know that I speak for all sides of the House when I say that.

These are difficult times. We now have 4,500 Canadians, young men and women, deployed in 17 different parts of the world. When we first came to this House we had about 1,500 in about seven or eight places. I also want to mention some of the goals I had when I arrived here. I suppose my main goal was to serve my constituents to the best of my ability.

• (2020)

There is one in particular that I believe was achievable. I have not actually achieved it but I think I have moved it along and other members in the House have helped me. It is the business of Canada taking control over that portion of our domain called the nose and tail of the Grand Banks.

I think every member in the House has heard me speak on that. A highlight for me was when I was allowed to have a private member's motion that was debated in this House on three separate occasions, in February, March and in the dying days of this government on Monday morning. All sides of the House spoke on the subject. The motion was voted on. I could not have achieved more in the sense of getting it to that point after four and a half years. Regrettably the motion did not carry because there were not enough votes in support of it, but I feel honoured that I was able to represent almost 100,000 Newfoundlanders, my constituents, and raise their profile by raising this very motion which is germane, if not directly to every one of my constituents, certainly indirectly in the second or third case.

I will close by saying that yes there have been disappointments. Yes the economy is in rough shape and yes decisions have been made that I did not agree with. I have spoken in detail on that but I do not believe this is the night to be specific. I am sure other people on both sides of the House will be specific about that.

I simply want to say one more time what a great pleasure, what a feeling of pride it is to stand here in this House tonight and say that I represent close to 100,000 of my constituents and they are great constituents. How do I judge that? I have been in a lot of houses, like all members in the House, and I have been in houses where I knew the political philosophy was entirely different from mine, but I have yet to enter a house or knock on the door and been treated with anything but total civility and the hospitality for which Newfoundlanders and indeed my constituents have become known.

I want to say to them what a great pleasure it has been to serve them. They will be seeing as much of me this summer as they have in past summers. I will continue to look after their concerns, even though the House is not sitting, in the hope of coming back to renew their concerns on whatever side of the House that is going to be.

I am not giving a farewell speech, but I think it would be inappropriate for me to sit down without thanking members of my family who have made their sacrifices and particularly my wife Gwenneth who comes to Ottawa some weekends. In the wintertime I am off to the riding and in the summer it is sometimes reversed. I have great admiration for how she does this, like all wives and spouses, without a complaint. For the staff members who work for me and who put in a lot of long hours I could not ask for, nor could any member, more loyal, dedicated people who work in the best interests of my concerns and the concerns of the constituents.

I would like to thank all the staff of the House of Commons—we have all made great friends here—the office of the Speaker, you, Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Speaker and the Speaker to whom many accolades were paid today. Thanks particularly to the security guards who serve such a fantastic function and always have a smile for us even when we are so busy that we do not even really think about that aspect of life. I have always treasured the friendship of my colleagues and I hope that anything that has happened in the heat of debate will not be considered to be personal. As we dissolve this Parliament and go on to other things, whether it is back for another political session in the 35th Parliament or another session of the 34th Parliament, I would like to believe we can all leave here better for having served, better friends and with more friends for having served as well.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you. I thank all those who have helped me and in particular I thank my colleagues and constituents for allowing me this rare pleasure for any Canadian. I wish everybody the best of luck, goodwill and best wishes.

• (2025)

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops): Mr. Speaker, I know there is a speech coming up as it ought to be from my hon. friend from Parry Sound—Muskoka so I want to make a short comment. I want to echo the comments of my hon. colleague who has just spoken and say how pleased we are in terms of how we have been served as members of Parliament by Speaker Fraser, Madam Champagne, and you, Mr. Speaker. We appreciate that

your even-handed speakership has enabled this place to function as well as it has.

I say thank you to the Clerk of the House and all the Table officers who have worked so hard late into the night many times to facilitate the work of this House. Thank you to the staff at Journals and Table Research who have provided us with incredible back-up service to make this House of Commons function. Thank you to the pages, the security staff and especially the House leaders, my colleagues with whom I have worked for many years. Thank you to the Whips of the various political parties, my colleague from Thunder Bay—Atikokan and my colleague for Nanaimo—Cowichan as caucus chair. Again I want to acknowledge the fact that we have worked incredibly co-operatively over the months and years past. I do not think people appreciate the amount of co-operation and the give and take that occurs in this place to make this House of Commons work as effectively as it does.

I want to thank the House staff members for their support. They are very dedicated and talented individuals. I also want to thank the members' staff who work with us as members of Parliament to enable us to pursue our responsibilities and duties as called upon by our constituents.

I want to say a particular thank you to my family and friends. The members of my family have given up a great deal over the last 14 years and I appreciate their dedication and what they have given up to have their husband and father away for long periods of time.

I want to say thank you to my leader, the member for Yukon, and of course I say thank you to my Whip, my House leader's assistant and the deputy House leader, the hon. member for Winnipeg—Transcona. Thank you to the people of Kamloops who for the last 13 years have given me their vote of confidence and enabled me to serve them in honour. It has been a privilege to serve the people of the great city of Kamloops and the surrounding region.

I also want to say to my friends and colleagues in the House of Commons that we have carried on passionate debates in this House. We have confronted one another with different points of view. I think what is fundamental to this House and the parliamentary process is that while we may differ in terms of what we believe is the appropriate course of action to take economically, socially, culturally or politically, we continue to respect one another for our different points of views.

Whether it is simply opposition parties debating with the government or opposition parties debating with opposition parties, I think the important thing to say to the people of Canada is that while we debate and argue strenuously and this is often a very combative environment, underneath it all is a respect and compassion that we share with one another.

It is with reluctance that I wish everyone well in the months ahead. As we enter into our various political campaigns we all have the respect of the people of Canada and the commitment that the collective will of our constituents is the right decision. I think it is fair to say that those who are returned to this place will be the correct people to be returned to this place as a reflection of the democratic principles to which we all so strongly adhere and believe.

Again I want to thank my colleagues for this experience and look forward to seeing the will of the people reflected in the next House of Commons.

• (2030)

Mr. Stan Darling (Parry Sound—Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have the opportunity to say a few words. I would like to thank most sincerely my colleague from Bonavista—Trinity—Conception.

I have had the privilege of sitting on the Standing Committee for National Defence and Veterans Affairs with the hon. member and certainly he has added greatly to it. He has had more experience than I as far as defence is concerned.

I do not know him too well but I have talked to him briefly. He said he enlisted as a young sailor some few years ago from a small fishing village in Newfoundland and retired as a Rear Admiral while still a young man and then entered the House of Commons. It was certainly great to be with him.

I have served 21 years as the member of Parliament for Parry Sound—Muskoka. I entered the House of Commons at an advanced age compared to most. I remember the people at the time saying that if I got elected at that age I would probably only last one term and be a sort of caretaker member of Parliament.

In fact I agreed with them and said that is probably what I would do. I have been carrying on as a caretaker member of Parliament for six elections, successfully I might say. At my tender age I have come to the conclusion that it is probably time for retirement before the voters retire me. They say it is a good idea to leave while people still want you. There have been a few that

have been asking me to run again. There are many younger ones who could run.

In fact even two or three elections ago there were a great many interested in the job and some of them would be asking after my health and would even come up and take my pulse just to check on it. But I have been able to carry on, putting in a good day's work as my hon. colleague mentioned.

However, there does come a time and this is of course going out over the air. I have told my riding association and gave them some months' notice to look around. I told them to find somebody but I want the riding to remain in the Progressive Conservative fold. That is the important part but I am quite sure a very satisfactory replacement will be found with a spirited nominating convention.

Of course I will look back with a great deal of regret at leaving. This has been a wonderful place. All members make friends. I guess people in the ridings wonder and they will say: "What are you doing fraternizing with the Liberals or the NDP? You are there to defeat them and do this and do that". I tell them it comes as a shock but there are a lot of very nice people on the opposition side. I guess I am one who has a great rapport with members of the other side. I enjoy talking to them, I enjoy being with them. I do not enjoy some of the things they say when they are standing at their seat but that is to be expected. I guess I am not too controversial a member of Parliament. I came here to look after the wants and needs of my constituents which are many.

• (2035)

Being members of the government over the last few years puts us on the hot seat all of the time. We are blamed for everything. We are told that Canada is the most terrible country in the world and the recession was dreamed up by the Prime Minister himself. Yet we as members of Parliament when we travel beyond our borders are looked at with awe and with the greatest respect. We are told we are from Canada, the most magnificent country in the world. I have said to more than one person: "I wish to hell you would come back to Canada and tell the Canadians that because they do not seem to believe it".

I had the great privilege about a year ago to visit Rio de Janeiro at the UNCED conference, the great environmental conference attended I think by 180 countries and the heads of state from 20 of the greatest countries. Those people, when they saw the maple leaf, brightened up and wanted to talk to us and tell us just what they had heard about Canada.

I am certainly very unhappy that 1.5 million are unemployed. A good many in my riding, which is a rural riding, are unemployed. It is not a great industrial area, but it certainly is a beautiful place. People love to live in Parry Sound—Muskoka. There are probably higher paying jobs in other areas but they want to live where they were brought up. The economy there certainly is improving.

I happen to be in a tourist area and the tourist industry has been hard hit due to the recession. Of course last year was a disaster because along with the recession we also had terrible weather. Every weekend it was raining and cold so it was really a disaster.

I heard my colleagues this evening commenting on the economy, berating the government for the free trade agreement and the recently approved NAFTA. I wonder what they are thinking about. It is all very well to say that there are a great many jobs lost. The figure quoted here a couple times by the hon. member for Kamloops is that 400,000 manufacturing jobs were lost over a period of time. There was no mention of the many thousands of new jobs that have been created. There was no mention of the fact that there are more people working now. After all, there were all these students and young people coming into the work force over the last two or three years and nobody seems to consider that.

We are a country of 27 million people. Are we going to manufacture just for our own citizens and forget about trading? We are a trading nation and if we are going to trade then we certainly have to open our own borders and purchase goods from our neighbours.

If the free trade agreement is so terrible and has caused so many jobs to be lost how is it that Canada and the United States are the two greatest trading partners in the world?

• (2040)

President Reagan was asked what the greatest trading partner of the United States was. I guess he is not the greatest economist and so he said: "I guess it is Japan". His neighbour, Canada, certainly beat Japan by a great deal. Our trade now is $200 billion a year in two-way trade, and Canada has a surplus. We are selling more than we are buying. Is that such a bad deal?

Jobs have been lost, and possibly that is true, but new jobs have also been created. Many industries have started up here. Many industries have enlarged their capacities because of the free trade agreement.

Why is it that several other countries are just drooling at the mouth at the idea of the Canada-U.S. trade agreement, hoping they can get the same deal? Israel is one country that has some trade breaks, but they are not nearly as good as Canada's.

These are the things that the Canadian people should be thinking about. The NAFTA, which is supposed to be a disaster according to the opposition and the media, will provide us with a market of about 300 million people. It will be the greatest market in the world. There is a lot of worry and criticism about Mexico's 85 million people, not taking into consideration at all that those people will be purchasing goods. At the present time Mexico and Canada have very insignificant two-way trade. It is $2.5 billion but the worst part is that of that $2.5 billion Canada only has $600 million, and most of those goods trade back and forth without any tariffs at all.

I am quite sure the NAFTA will prove to be successful. The Prime Minister has been berated for the things that he has done. He has had the guts to do things that other governments were afraid to tackle. With regard to the GST, the opposition and the public at large consider it to be a new tax but it is a replacement for the manufacturers' sales tax of 13.5 per cent. As an example, Canadian Tire, which is a huge chain across the country, now says that 90 per cent or more of the goods sold in its stores are cheaper than when the manufacturers' sales tax was in effect. That is the fact. However that does not seem to sink in.

The other thing is that the GST is broadly based. It could have been more broadly based but we did not want to include food. The GST at 7 per cent is berated by the public but they do not seem to have any criticism of the 8 per cent Ontario provincial sales tax. I am wondering if that is really fair. When one is in government one has to take the good with the bad.

All the time we hear our colleagues across the House talking about the free trade agreement and the NAFTA agreement, and the various items in it. They are scaring the Canadian people that water is going to be transported or diverted to the United States. That is absolutely incorrect. Water will be sold to the United States but it will be sold in bottles. It will be sold in bottles of mineral water, beer and wine. Surely no Canadian is going to say that that is the incorrect thing to do. We have to educate the public. I am telling the people in my riding, and we have lots of water there, water is not going to be diverted.

• (2045)

I want to pay tribute to all the people in my riding of Parry Sound—Muskoka who have supported me over the past 21 years. I have endeavoured to work on their behalf. Certainly I have not satisfied them all from the letters I get. A great many of them come in and say I am doing a good job, but they were not singing the praises of the Prime Minister.

Speaking of the Prime Minister, even though he is low in the polls, he is going to have a very important place in history because he has been able to have a government that would bring in these things that have not helped his popularity. But they are in the best interest of Canada and he has taken that stand. Certainly I say more power to him for that.

At this time I would like to pay a special tribute to my staff. The success of a member of Parliament and his or her continuing re-election depends on the staff. They are the ones who take the telephone calls and have to get all the information that is necessary. I have an outstanding staff.

I want to pay a special tribute to my constituency secretary in Burk's Falls, Mrs. Ina Trolove, who often works six and seven days a week. She is the most knowledgeable person one could ever lay eyes on. She can handle anything and she is about three months younger than I am. What do you think of that? Then of course I have an excellent staff in Ottawa, my chief secretary, Mary Culinin, Melanie Byck and an outstanding research assistant, Phillip McNeil.

It has been a privilege to serve the great riding of Parry Sound—Muskoka. I came to this place at an age when a lot of people retire and I have been able to have a career of 21 years. It is the most exciting career I could possibly think of. I know all of us are proud of the fact that we are able to sit in the House of Commons despite the low repute we are held in by the people across the country. The message should be getting across that politics is an honourable profession. There should be more people looking into the possibility of serving their country.

As I look back on my career and my stay in the House and am asked what I have done, if anything, besides vote with the party, stand up and be here as often as I am told, I think back over the last 13 years when I have been deeply involved in the question of acid rain and the environment. I worked hard on these and I feel that I have contributed something.

I know I was involved in it when it was the best kept secret in the United States and not too prominent here. But we kept going down and meeting with the members of the U.S. Congress. I remember one of the prominent members of the House of Representatives saying: "Mr. Darling, do not give us this talk about acid rain. You are coming down here trying to scare us and sell us your hydro power from Ontario and Quebec". This was a tough thing to overcome. It is one thing I can take some pride in.

I will certainly miss this House when the next Parliament sits, but I guess it is time to just relax and take it easy. I will be celebrating my 82nd birthday a month from today, July 16.

• (2050)

Once more, I want to thank all the people in my riding who supported me and tell them how much I have enjoyed representing the great riding of Parry Sound—Muskoka.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Shirley Maheu (Saint-Laurent—Cartierville): Madam Speaker, once again, we are adjourning ahead of schedule, as if the House had finished all its business. What a fallacy. Again, the Conservative government is making it clear that Canadians do not count for much. Again, the government is forcing the House to adjourn before dealing with the major problems. Nothing has been done to create jobs. There have been no announcements about guaranteeing young people an adequate education. There is nothing on the horizon to improve the well-being of senior citizens. There are no programs to provide affordable housing for the far too many Canadians who need it.

Unfortunately, this is only the beginning of a long list. In other words, the Conservative government just because it worked so hard to elect a new leader thinks it is time to take a rest, and the best way to do this is to leave the problems of Canadians in limbo. Perhaps it actually intends to let the next Liberal government deal with these problems and clean up the mess. We will certainly have a lot of work to do, but we are not afraid of work. We are prepared to work long hours to improve the quality of life of all our fellow citizens.

[*English*]

Ever since the Conservatives came to power they have said that they would be encouraging high technology. I want to address one specific local issue that in my opinion characterized the way the Tories did business while in government.

For years the city of Saint-Laurent has been at the forefront of high technology and aerospace industrial development in Canada. In my riding of Saint-Laurent—Cartierville we have two airports, Dorval and Cartierville. Canadair and other aerospace industries are located just minutes away from downtown Montreal. Despite these characteristics the Conservatives decided to place the space agency in St. Hubert, away from the people that they need to do business with.

It is time for a change. It is time for the government to do business with the needs of the people in mind and set aside partisanship for the benefit of Canada. Canadians are tired of this government because of what it has done to the political process. The Tories have tried to make this institution, Parliament, irrelevant. They have taken the voice of the people away from the decision-making process and have placed it in the hands of lobbyists and bureaucrats. By the time a policy makes its way to the House of Commons, there is very little room for debate.

In the past five years that I have been in Parliament, I can no longer count the number of times that the Conservative government has used its majority to cut off debate on a whole series of issues. Canadians are cynical of this tired approach to government. They want openness. They want accountability and, most importantly,

they want to know that their vote makes a difference and that their concerns will be addressed in Parliament.

[*Translation*]

Today's senior citizens worked to improve living conditions in this country. They are the people who contributed most to medicare. These are the Canadians who worked hard all their lives to provide a better future for their children and grandchildren. And what is the Conservative government doing in return? Am I expected to announce some fantastic project? Do not count on it.

• (2055)

The Conservatives said quite innocently that user fees for health care was a suggestion to be taken seriously, so seriously that their party leader wrote to *The Toronto Star* on April 30 of this year that if she became Prime Minister, she would allow the introduction of user fees. On June 25, she will be the Prime Minister. What can we expect? But that is not all.

The Conservative government also decided to reform old age pensions, which the Liberals put in place in 1952 to assure that all Canadians would have a pension to supplement their retirement income. What about the money today's senior citizens contributed over the years so that they would enjoy a secure old age? Well, the Conservatives decided they had other priorities.

They would rather spend $5.8 billion on helicopters instead of paying old age pensions. And then they wonder why they are not popular.

[*English*]

The Conservatives not only have abandoned Canada's seniors, they have dropped Canada's youth, our future, from the agenda as well. Canada's disappointing economic performance under Tory rule is one of the greatest obstacles facing young Canadians. Statistics predict that the unemployment rate in Canada will be at least 11.5 per cent over the next year, youth unemployment traditionally being at least 5 per cent higher than that of the general public.

For those whose education does not extend beyond high school, the prognosis is poor. As we approach the year 2000 the proportion of the work force requiring high skills will increase from 45 to 64 per cent. Two-thirds of all new jobs created in this country between 1989 and the year 2000 will require at least 12 years of education and the remaining jobs will call for at least 16. Those numbers indicate with great clarity that this government has abandoned Canada's youth.

[*Translation*]

This government, which so easily forgets our seniors, has the same trouble with our youth. This group has the skills, the energy and the will to work. The Conservatives keep promising and talking about jobs, but that's all they do.

Where are their fantastic job creation programs? Where are the permanent jobs that will help young graduates at all levels earn a decent living? Where are the summer jobs to guarantee that students have the money to pay for their education? Where is the incentive for young people to get a diploma, which if the Liberals do not take office as soon as possible will be just a worthless piece of paper? Tories are all talk and no action.

We must save our human resources. All this potential may be lost forever and I want us to hold on to it. We Liberals are ready to lend a helping hand and work together with these young people so they will have a future, as we did.

[*English*]

Many young people feel either rejected or marginalized in society which creates additional problems of crime and drug and alcohol abuse. We have to focus on youth now more than ever before and finally end the politics of exclusion and encourage our youth to participate.

Creating a national apprenticeship program that would encourage our youth to stay in school and help their transition into the work force is a first step. It would also provide an alternative to attending college or university.

The establishment of a Canadian environmental youth force, a volunteer organization that would work on environment reclamation and educational programs would not only benefit our environment badly damaged by the policies of this government, but would also help in developing learning skills and good work habits. It would promote interest in science and awareness of environ-

mental issues which is a great positive step we need to take.

• (2100)

It is time we elected a government that not only talks about our youth but does something about it. This government gets a passing grade when it comes to talking, but it fails miserably when it comes to action.

When it comes to fighting racism, for example, the Conservatives have learned all the right words but they still have failed to fight it effectively.

I cannot understand the inaction of this government, specifically the Minister of National Defence and the Prime Minister, with regard to the deliberate organized infiltration of the Armed Forces by neo-Nazi and racist organizations. Let me be perfectly blunt. As with other issues affecting race relations in this country, the government is simply burying its head in the sand.

[*Translation*]

This government which neglects seniors and discourages youth has abandoned the very young and their parents. I know very well that it can bring out figures and studies to show us the opposite, but where, for example, is the child care program that we have heard so much about for 10 years?

What about its proposals to change the statistical standards for determining the number of poor people in this country? Do the Conservatives really think that Canadians are so easily fooled? Do they think that Canadians do not see everyday reality? Does the Conservative government believe that forcing Statistics Canada to lower its figures will wipe away the facts? The economy has not yet turned up and jobs are still as hard to find, if not increasingly scarce.

Where are the programs, which the Conservative government seems to want to study to death, to get thousands of children out of unacceptable poverty?

It is intolerable that nearly a million children suffer physically and mentally from malnutrition in a G-7 country. It is unacceptable that in Canada, in our own backyard, children cannot get the food they need to be healthy. It is unacceptable that thousands of Canadian children go to school malnourished, often poorly dressed for the weather, unable to concentrate on an empty stomach.

In 1993, at the end of the Conservative government's term, the poor are at a dead end. After 10 years of unkept promises, Canadians no longer have confidence or hope. The Conservatives have brought this country to its knees, and it will be up to us Liberals to put it back on its feet.

Canada's children absolutely must be able to have a good start in life. Young people absolutely must be able to have a vision of the future and the means to achieve it. Adults must again be given job security and seniors must again have the security of an adequate pension.

We Liberals know how to listen to Canadians all across the country. We also know not to make promises that we could not keep.

It is high time to give back to all the people of this country what they need to really get out of their predicament: training and jobs. It is high time to say good bye to this Conservative government.

[*English*]

Mr. John E. Cole (York—Simcoe): Madam Speaker, it certainly is a pleasure and a distinct honour to stand today to speak to this adjournment motion.

At the end of almost five years in government when I was elected and stood in this House to give my first speech—I was probably more nervous then than I am today—a lot of things have happened in that period of time.

From my initiation, which quite frankly, Madam Speaker, I still believe you were a part of but might not want to admit it today, to the present has been a very interesting and challenging time for me as a member of Parliament.

• (2105)

I look forward to the coming election. I hope the good people of York—Simcoe will have seen in me a person who has tried to serve them to the best of his particular abilities. I hope when they vote they will indicate that this particular member should come back to serve them in this the highest court in the land. It is a real privilege and honour to serve the people of York—Simcoe in the House of Commons of Canada.

This really is a special place. We can think of all the things that happen here. We can talk about the legislative issues and the debates that take place across the floor of this House, the discussions over free trade, of whether it is good, bad or indifferent. We can think of some of the other things that have occurred.

We all know that this has probably been one of the busiest sessions the Parliament of Canada has ever had. We recognize that. The leader of the New Democratic Party put it best when she said that a lot of things could be said about this government but one thing that can be said is that it did make a lot of decisions. The New Democratic Party did not agree with a lot of those decisions and that is fair, but one thing I do not think this government will ever be accused of is not being afraid to make decisions.

Some of those decisions were certainly not the most popular ones. I believe standing here today that they were the right decisions. They were the right legislative decisions. They were the kinds of decisions that will make Canada a better place for my children and maybe even my grandchildren if I am blessed that way some day.

We can think of a lot of things that were very difficult. The world has changed in the course of this five years. We can think of the former Soviet Union. We can think of Germany and the wall coming down. We can think of the way we communicate with each other and our relationships with different countries.

Who would have thought five years ago that we would be entering into a trade agreement with Mexico? Who would have thought five or ten years ago that virtually every home in this country would have a computer, that we would be thinking of new ways to handle those methods of communication?

It certainly has been a very challenging time for me as the representative of the people from York—Simcoe. It certainly has been a wonderful experience.

Many times since I was elected back in November 1988 people have asked me to describe being a member of Parliament. Earlier today a House leader mentioned that we get beat upon. The media like to criticize us. All MPs are this, that and the other thing. We all know better from being in this place.

When people ask me what it is like to be a member of Parliament there are really two words to describe it. It is exhilarating and exhausting. I say those two words because in first coming into this House of Commons we all feel a bit of fear and trepidation.

We see the traditions. We see what it means to be a member of Parliament. We see the importance of it and we believe in the very importance of this structure because this is the heart of our democracy. This is the heart of Canada. This is what Canada really means to all of us. We see that and we see the highs and lows associated with that. It is very exhilarating to feel a part of that process.

It is also very exhausting. I can say this because I have seen virtually every member of this House work late into the night, get up very early the next morning, attend committee meetings, morning, noon and night, and take part in debates, which sometimes run right around the clock in this particular House.

It is a very exhausting business. Not only do we have our responsibilities here but we also have responsibilities back in our constituencies. We look at those things and we think of our constituency. We think of the people who are there most of the time.

We think very often of our family and friends. We do not get to see them as often as we might have in the past. But we made that choice. We as members of Parliament made the choice to come to this place to be able to take part in it.

• (2110)

I know from speaking to virtually every member of this House that they are very proud to be here, to be able to represent their constituents. The decisions we have to make are very challenging. They are not easy ones. It is not an easy decision to have to face the consequences of saying: "Yes, my country will take part in a mission led by the UN into the gulf which could potentially lead to world-wide war". That is not an easy decision.

We have had to make many decisions over the course of the last five years. In fact one of the members when I was talking to him not too long ago said that he had seen more in the last five years than he had seen in the last 25 years. For those of us who are rookies and have come in and seen this it really has been a wonderful experience in that regard.

Probably the most important aspect of being a member of Parliament and certainly the most thrilling part for a

lot of us when we came in 1988 was to meet the many people whom we had looked up to over the years for their experience, knowledge and expertise, people like yourself, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, we have not looked up to you for very long because you have not been around here as long as some of the others. However, we have certainly looked up to you with respect for the kind of knowledge and experience you have brought to this place and for what you have done for Canada because that is very important.

We have seen people who have received tributes today, like the Deputy Prime Minister, the House leader and members of the opposition who may not be returning to this place because of choices they have made after serving this country for so many years. Just to be able to meet with them, to talk with them, to sit on a committee with them and to call them by their first names has been one of the greatest thrills for me. I do not think one could ever measure that, but it is something I will cherish for all my life.

We also get to meet members from all parts of this country. I did not understand the difference in the difficulties faced in my part of Canada just north of Toronto, Ontario and the difficulties my colleague from Regina faces. There are differences in this country.

I had the privilege of visiting Iqaluit not too long ago. A three hour plane ride did not seem like too big a deal, but it was minus 70 when I arrived. It was nippy. I was able to speak with some of the people up there. I spoke with the member who does not happen to sit on this side of the House, but we spoke about some of the difficulties. That was in our country. We had virtually an 80 degree Celsius temperature change in this country.

We forget the expanse of this country, the changes and the differences and that is just going straight north. We go through five and a half time zones east to west. No wonder we have difficulties in communicating and working with one another. It is closer for the people on the east coast to go to England and Europe and there are fewer time zones than when they go to Vancouver, British Columbia.

When we think of what we have accomplished as a nation and as a country it is just so wonderful to feel that in our own little way we have been able to play a small part. To me it has been a wonderful thrill.

I was listening earlier to the member for Bonavista—Trinity—Conception. Last summer we had the privilege of twinning our ridings. One hundred and twenty young people from my riding went to the east coast of Newfoundland and 120 young people from the east coast of Newfoundland came to York—Simcoe.

It was a great learning experience for those young people and others accompanying them. It was culture shock. Both groups went through culture shock when they arrived. They did not understand the differences between our communities. But when they went home they had a better understanding of what it was like to live in another part of Canada three or four time zones away. That was a wonderful experience. I could not have been part of that if I had not been serving as a member of Parliament.

I think of members of the opposition with whom I have had the privilege of working, certainly in the Whip's office. To the Official Opposition Whip who has come in, it has been my pleasure to work with him and the Whip from the New Democratic Party.

• (2115)

I think of the Whips I have served under and have had the privilege of being assistant to on the government side. I certainly appreciate the knowledge and expertise they have brought to the job. I also appreciate the staff of the Whip's office. I know I give them a hard time once in a while but we know they are the ones who run the place. They certainly run a lot of the government members around. I do appreciate the work they have done and the work my own office staff does, whether on the Hill or in Newmarket and throughout the riding.

There is one thing that I have to comment on before I finish up tonight because it is probably one of the real disappointments that I have felt in this place. It is a twofold disappointment in that before November 21, 1988 those of us who were rookies came here because we were upstanding, upright citizens. We were dedicated and we did the right things. We were respected in our communities, and all the other things that went with it.

Two days later we were one of those politicians from Ottawa. We seemed to lose that respect. The media seemed to take that away from us very quickly.

When I go home the people in my riding will say to me: "We understand it is not you, John. It is not you as our member. We are not suggesting that but we are still prepared to make the generalization". That hurts because I see how hard members on all sides of this House work and I see the dedication.

We have a different philosophy as to how we are going to make Canada better. We can all agree on that. However with the exception of a very few people in this place we are all here to make Canada a better place.

That leads me to the second major concern that I have. There are some people who are sitting in this House who do not want to make Canada a better place. They do not want to make Canada grow. They do not want to make Canada the best country in the world. They want to break this country up. They want to act as traitors to the country in this very place. I can see people who sit over there whose only goal, only stated ambition, is to destroy Canada and to do it from within.

For some reason, because we are a free and democratic society, we have forced ourselves into allowing these kinds of people to represent parts of this country in the House of Commons, the highest institution in the land. We have allowed them to take a seat and do anything and everything in their power to destroy Canada, such as disruptive tactics in the House, statements outside of the House and getting elected or potentially getting re-elected on the basis that they are going to destroy this great country. In my opinion that should not happen now and should never be allowed to happen in the future. I hope the people they represent will think about that.

I did not want to get partisan tonight and I do not think this is a partisan issue. This is a Canadian issue. We are here to serve Canada and make Canada a better country. I am proud to represent the people of York—Simcoe and to make sure that happens.

I have no respect for those people who come here and stand up in a grandiose way. They are so sanctimonious one would think it was the greatest thing in the world that they would stand there. Who are these members? We know who those members are. They are members who were elected not on the basis of breaking up this country but on other bases. As a result of the fact that their nose got out of joint for whatever other reason they decided to sit in that back row and do everything in their power to destroy this great country.

Madam Speaker, if you had the power to remove them from this place and try them as traitors or whatever then I am sure you would do that because I know your love for this country is as great as my love for this country, even though we come from different parts of this country.

• (2120)

It has certainly been an honour for me to be here. In closing, I wish to thank all the members, the staff, the Clerk and the Speaker. Everyone has been great, particularly the pages. It has really been an honour and a great privilege. I particularly want to thank the people of York—Simcoe for allowing me to be here for almost five years. I hope I can serve them again for the next four or five years.

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops): Madam Speaker, I want to say to my hon. friend that all of us endorse his words about those few members in here who represent the Bloc Quebecois and whose sole purpose is to break up the country. That is something that we abhor and that we feel is not right. I am sure all of us in our own collective way will do whatever we can to combat them.

While I am on my feet to make a comment I want to say to my hon. friend who represents the government that on behalf of the constituents of Kamloops and all the communities and rural areas surrounding Kamloops I would like to thank him and his colleagues for giving us the privilege of hosting the Canada Summer Games this summer.

I recognize that there were a number of constituencies that had applied for this honour, that a number of communities had sought to have the privilege of hosting the Canada Summer Games. We appreciate the opportunity to be able to be the showcase for Canada this summer. I hope that all of his colleagues join with the rest of us in the House of Commons and our families to visit Kamloops this summer and show our support for the young athletes during the Canada Summer Games.

I want to take this opportunity to mention one point that my hon. friend raised earlier, and that is with regard to those men and women who served in the Korean war. Earlier we had a discussion that recognized those men and women who received medals recently for their service during the Korean war. I choose those words consciously. People have often referred to the Korean war as a Korean conflict. They have never acknowledged that it was a war and that men and women from Canada were there to protect freedom and democracy and to put their lives on the line. Therefore we ought to be thanking those men and women who served so gallantly during that war on behalf of Canada and for what our country stands for: democracy, freedom and peace.

In conclusion I simply want to thank those who serve in our Armed Forces, particularly those serving today in the peacekeeping areas of Somalia, the former Yugoslavia, Cambodia and other trouble spots of the world. These young men and women are prepared to lay down their lives to represent Canada. It is up to us to ensure that they are able to carry out their functions properly, fully serviced with the best equipment and support systems available. It is also up to us to say that we acknowledge, recognize and show our appreciation to those who served and serve in our army, navy and air force as well as our reserves and our cadet corps.

I want to draw particular attention to those who serve in the Rocky Mountain Rangers, who have for many years now made an incredible contribution to Canada's Armed Forces, as well as to the submariners and the merchant mariners. As an auxiliary to those serving on the oceans of the world those people have demonstrated their commitment to Canada and what we stand for. We have to acknowledge that our Armed Forces are secondary to none in the world. It is interesting to note that whenever forces are called upon to serve in peacekeeping or peacemaking missions the first people to be called upon are those in the Canadian Armed Forces. For that we can all be truly proud.

• (2125)

Mr. Len Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke): Madam Speaker, when the hon. member for Kamloops got up to speak I thought the least he was going to do was offer to billet the hon. member for York Simcoe. He was waiting on that too during the games this summer.

I want to say first that this afternoon when the tributes were flowing out to Mr. Speaker in well-deserved fashion, you as our interim Chair were not mentioned at all. After I sat down I felt badly about that because I think that you have done a very good job in the chair, having been called upon rather suddenly, and I do want to pay that tribute to you this evening. I am sure others in the House will agree.

I want to start off tonight by talking about the Canadian Armed Forces. I have a major base in my riding. As a matter of fact I live in Petawawa township, just three miles from the base gate. Prior to coming to this House I was on the staff of General Panet High School on the base and got to know a lot of military families. I got to know how they lived and what their aspirations really were.

I always look upon our Canadian forces as being among the greatest forward-looking people that this country has. No institution and no organization in Canada has ever really carried the Canadian flag with pride to so many parts of the world as have the Canadian forces.

As we see the various incidents arise around the world today, we know that there are many many trouble spots. We are asking our Canadian forces to go in to all kinds of challenges, all kinds of difficult situations and many different cultures. It is very difficult sometimes to adjust to all of that. We Canadians who expect them to undertake these difficult tasks and challenges and to handle them with decorum and dignity under the United Nations banner must give them credit when they do an excellent job, when they build schools, when they build roads and bridges, when they teach local people how to grow food and practise the elements of agriculture.

There is no group that is willing in so many ways to help other people of the world to work toward success in their own country. As a result, sometimes incidents occur. As we send them into more difficult situations in the world there are going to be incidents that occur that require investigations and so on. But that is no excuse whatsoever to label our Canadian forces in general. I take great exception to some of the media coverage that has been given to them and particularly that which was

given to the Canadian Airborne Regiment stationed in Petawawa.

These are families, too. They must live. When their spouses are under criticism in the media and in the country it is difficult on those families. We had incidents of very difficult situations for some of the children of those families in the schools. It is totally unfair for people to serve our nation and at the same time have to face this kind of situation at home. They are there to do a job and they will do the job.

• (2130)

Some people today say that the cold war is over, we do not need any of our forces, we can cut back on them and we can do with much less and so on. Look around the world. What do we see today? We see problems in every region of the world today and that is where we are asking our Canadian forces to go. If we are going to cut back on our military community today then what we are doing is putting ourself in a less prepared way to face the challenges faced by us in the world at large.

Where does it place us so far as our work with the United Nations is concerned? Canada is so well respected around the world. We must continue to work with the United Nations, with the other members of the United Nations and show the unity not only within Canada itself as many of us are very interested in doing these days and every day, but unity within the world community itself and peace.

If we allow these disturbances in various parts of the world to grow into major wars then we have not allowed ourselves the pleasure or accepted the responsibility of bringing peace to the world at large.

What happened in World War I? Let us do a little historical study here. World War I broke out because the rest of the countries in the free world were not prepared for what they had to face when World War I was declared. Canada lost more than 66,000 in that war.

What did we do after World War I? We did exactly the same thing. The same thinking is going on today. We downsized our forces, cut back on them, we did not need them anymore. The First World War was the war to end all wars.

It only took a quarter of a century to start off with World War II. Who did we count on? We counted again on our younger generations in Canada and we enrolled 1.1 million in our forces in World War II. There were over 600,000 in World War I. In World War II we lost over 45,000 of those talented young people. That is not counting the wounded and those who are left with wounds for life and those who are left with nerve problems for life. They inherited horrendous situations from those two world wars.

Following World War II we did not have time to readjust before the Korean war came along. We were ready for that one and as a result we supported the United Nations strongly. The United Nations was able to win the Korean war, win the point of the UN of maintaining a boundary line that had been drawn under UN auspices. That line was defended. We lost another 516 young people in the Korean war, to say nothing of the wounded who lived on after.

The Department of Veterans Affairs over the years has been the department to look after veterans in this country. A lot of those people now are getting older. It behoves us in this Parliament to give them their just due and to give them the benefit of the doubt when they make claims for war injuries and problems that arose out of those wars.

All we have to do today is look at Yugoslavia to find out what a tremendous liability and problem it is to have people who cannot live together in peace.

• (2135)

We have to handle those situations and certainly countries are coming together to handle them but we must continue to support the United Nations and we must never give up on that international organization because to date it has done a far better job than any other international organization we have ever had in the world for that purpose.

As we ask our soldiers to go around the world to various points of duty and to handle very difficult situations let us think of those families too who are here at home and who need a little help at that time and certainly a great deal of support.

I cannot sit down tonight without talking about medicare. I was in the hospital for several days recently and I heard on the television set how we had to cut back on medicare in this country. It was getting too expensive and the bottom line had to be such and such a figure.

If there is anything in this country that every member of Parliament in this House should be standing up and defending to the *n*th degree it is our medicare system. We meet people in hospital who would lose if they did not have the medicare system supporting them in this Canada of ours where we have a feeling for our fellow human beings. They would lose their homes, farms and businesses. There is no question about that. We know what the costs are today for operations and medical attention.

Our medical science in this country has done wonders over the years. One of the greatest speeches I will always remember was delivered by a member of this House. It was the hon. member for Crowfoot when he returned to this House last November after being away for five months receiving a heart transplant. I have sent his speech out to many people. I have given his speech to many doctors and nurses and hospital staff. It is an inspiration to them because how often do we say thank you to those people?

We have right here in the nation's capital one of the best heart institutes that we will find anywhere in the world. Who was the master-mind behind it? Yes, there were engineers. There were administration people solidly in support of it. There was a great community of interest throughout the Ottawa Valley and in the nation's capital for it. However the one who spearheaded it was Dr. Wilbert Keon.

I can well remember him coming up in the early 1980s to see me in my office in the West Block and he said: "Len, we must improve on our heart operation facilities in Ottawa for eastern Ontario, western Quebec and indeed for wherever people come from in looking for our assistance. We are putting patients out in the hall. We do not have the space and facilities for them".

I did go to work for him and worked very closely on a lobby to raise funds from the federal government to help improve on facilities at the heart institute. Little did I know that a few years later I would be one of the recipients of that excellent project.

I want to say this about Dr. Keon. He was born in a very small community in Pontiac County at Sheenboro, Quebec. Here was a man who went on to greatness and became a surgeon of real renown. As I have said before, he could have gone off to California. He could have gone to Texas or Boston and he could have written his own financial ticket but he did not. He chose to stay home and do his work here in Canada on behalf of Canadians and we thank him for that.

There have been many more like him. He has set the example for many doctors at that institute, technicians, nurses and administrators who are really top-notch people. I want to pay tribute to them on the floor of this House tonight.

• (2140)

The National Defence Medical Centre provides a lot of services for our diplomatic corps around the world and for our Canadian Armed Forces who come home to that hospital wherever they are. They have their own hospital and they do not take up beds for civilians at other hospitals in the city of Ottawa or other areas indeed in the country.

Dr. Leach is the head of cardiology at at the National Defence Medical Centre. Dr. Leach's grandfather, Harry Leach, still lives in his own home in the village of Chalk River in my riding and he is 96 years old while his father is General Leach who is retired. Dr. Leach is leading up a fantastic number of doctors, nurses and staff at the National Defence Medical Centre who are a pride not only to our Canadian forces but indeed to this Canada of ours. I want to pay tribute to them tonight as a tremendously dedicated group at the National Defence Medical Centre.

While I was in that hospital for a number of days I met an 85-year old lady who had had a triple bypass heart operation at the age of 72. She was back for her second operation at the age of 85. With her bypasses she was out walking up and down the corridor. Medical science in this country has gone ahead by leaps and bounds over recent years.

There is another quality that these people have besides medical knowledge and expertise and that is their attitude toward the people whom they are trying to help. They have the most genuine and kind approach to people that one could possibly have. For many people that means encouragement and a great deal of support.

For those people who want to cut back on medicare in this country it is very easy for someone to stand out on a street corner and say that we have to cut back on these expenses because of our national debt and our deficit and so on. I wonder how their minds would change if they had to go into hospital and face the trauma of cancer operations and treatments and were told by their doctor that their situation was serious. I wonder if their attitude would change the day they walked out of that hospital after a final examination to be told that their

treatment was a success. How can we possibly cut back on this kind of service that is so genuine and present as part of the Canadian over-all community?

He is not of my party but I must say that I felt sorry for a recent patient in the Civic Hospital who had been quite active in public life in this country. Dr. Keon was called upon to comment on whether or not that man had received special treatment because he was a Progressive Conservative. I think that is sick. It is sick because we all know or should know that when a heart transplant is available then the operation must be done. I felt sorry for Dalton Camp going through that particular operation and having these questions asked out on the street or by the news media. This is not the way we treat our fellow Canadians. It does not matter what role they play in life, what political party they belong to, what religious order they belong to or anything else. They are all Canadians and deserve fair treatment.

• (2145)

I want to mention that the Canadian troops have now taken down the Canadian flag in Cyprus and the troops who have been serving over there in recent months are coming back home to CFB Petawawa. I am sure everyone joins with me in welcoming them back.

As we look forward to the summer and fall I want to pay tribute to those members today who stood up and said they were leaving politics. They have served well. The hon. member for Parry Sound—Muskoka has been my neighbour for 21 years. Both of us have such large ridings that we virtually live a couple of hundred miles apart but we have some very common interests.

Madam Speaker, we want to wish you a good summer. We want to wish the hon. John Fraser, Speaker of this House, a very successful summer as he recuperates in Vancouver. We hope the new Prime Minister will take the family farm interests of this country with her to the Tokyo summit and strive to win the agricultural GATT discussions with regard to supply management. We hope she will take that up with the other members of the economic summit and win that battle for Canada. We need supply management in this country if our family farms are going to survive.

Thank you, Madam Speaker. We wish a good summer to you, the pages and staff here in the House of Commons and the constables who are always so very, very obliging to all of us.

Mr. Bob Speller (Haldimand—Norfolk): Madam Speaker, it is indeed a real pleasure for me to stand up on this adjournment debate before they shut off all the lights and turn off all the microphones for our summer recess.

I want to start, Madam Speaker, by taking this opportunity to thank my constituents. I want to thank them for giving me the opportunity over the past four and a half years to actually be here in this Chamber as a member of Parliament. To represent my country I think is one of the highest callings and I want to say to my constituents that I have appreciated that opportunity over the past four and a half years.

I also want to thank the staff and people here including people like the pages. I was talking to Steve Drover tonight, one of the pages, and he was telling me about the opportunities he is going to take this summer to do certain things. As I see the pages scurrying around here I want to take this opportunity to thank them because they do play an important role in this place, as you know.

I also want to take the opportunity to thank the different interns who come here. I have had an opportunity to obtain Michigan interns and law interns. They come from the United States and it has really given me an opportunity to get a better understanding of our American friends and share with them in dialogue some of the concerns we have here in Canada.

Finally, I want to pay tribute to my staff, because as with the staff of all members of Parliament they are really the people who give us our name. If it was not for my staff in the riding doing all the hard work it takes representing constituents in front of the bureaucrats in this country and explaining how government works when I am here in Ottawa, I know my job would be a lot more difficult and so I want to take this opportunity to thank them.

• (2150)

Some seven months ago the first addition to my family arrived. Christopher Speller has really brought joy to my life. He has really given me a better understanding of some of the concerns that young parents have in Canada today. I think the theme of my speech tonight will be to reflect on some of the views and concerns my constituents, especially those with young families have brought to me over the past four and a half years. They are some of the concerns that I feel have not been addressed by this government and so I want to relate them back to the fact that I do not feel we should be adjourning this House now.

I know everyone feels we should get out of here this evening but I do not believe that should be the case. I think there is a lot more work this Chamber should be doing now. I think there are a number of serious problems this country faces that we could be dealing with.

The hon. House leader of the Conservative Party noted all those fine pieces of legislation that have been passed through this House in the past little while but there are a number of concerns that Canadians have, not the least of which is a concern regarding this Chamber and how it works. People, especially those in some of the have not provinces who do not have an opportunity to get close to a member of Parliament or see how this Chamber works, feel that this Chamber does not represent them, that somehow democracy is not working in this country. That feeling is being expressed by people such as those in the Reform Party who feel that members of Parliament, especially backbench members of Parliament, should be freely able to represent their constituents and have free votes.

I have voted against my party on a few occasions and I am glad my hon. Whip is here and still talking to me. I have to say I agree that free votes are important. They are an important tool for members of Parliament to express the views of their constituents, but they are not the most important part of parliamentary reform. Over the past four and a half years over the hundreds and hundreds of votes that I have taken on behalf of my constituents I have felt on only three occasions that there was an issue of great importance to my constituents and I would have to vote against the wishes of my party.

There are many more things this House could do and many changes it could make that would make this place a lot more democratic and responsive to the needs of Canadians. I am talking specifically about the idea of more scrutiny of government expenditures and also of an ability of this House in terms of the development of legislation to be able to actually have a say in how that bill is developed.

As we know right now legislation is developed in the back rooms of certain ministries here in Ottawa. Bureaucracies get together and trade off different views and ideas. All the trade-offs are done outside this Chamber somewhere in and around Ottawa in the offices.

A member of Parliament like myself who wishes to help my constituents in the development of bills and have some say in how these decisions are being made has no say whatsoever. Committees of this House have to be able to develop legislation and take it through in a non-partisan way.

• (2155)

A lot of Canadians do not understand just how a committee works. We in the opposition and the government actually work quite well together in scrutinizing legislation. Without having that ability in the developmental stages, maybe in terms of a white paper or a green paper to have more of a say in how the legislation is developed, we as backbench members of Parliament or any member of Parliament will not be able to freely and fairly represent some of the interests of our constituents.

There has to be greater discussion of local concerns. I have raised many issues across my riding. I can remember one instance where there was a terrible tire fire in my riding. Canadians will remember it. I wanted an emergency debate on that issue. Under the rules, the Speaker at that time was not allowed to change the order of the day in the House in order to allow me to bring that forward for debate.

There are many other instances I have noticed over the years. Because of the stringent rules, the order of the House is not able to be changed to allow emergency circumstances to be debated in this House. There needs to be more leeway on the part of the Speaker or some rules changed to allow these sorts of debates to take place without just the agreement of the heads of the parties.

In terms of the one minute statements, I think there needs to be more than 15 minutes for one minute statements under Standing Order 31. There needs to be a better ability for members of Parliament to bring forward into the House certain concerns in their ridings. I do not know how it is in the other parties, but within our party we line up all the time just to get an issue on because unfortunately within the 15 minutes allotted, we on this side only get about four or five minutes.

As a result there needs to be more time spent within the day even if we have to tack it on at the end of the day to allow members of Parliament to have more than just a one minute say in those areas. With regard to reforming Question Period, there needs to be a lot more emphasis placed on the reform of Question Period.

I do not think that the government or this House have addressed these concerns at all. I do not believe that they have addressed the concerns of Canadians as to what this institution is all about and to how best to reform this institution to reflect their values and views of Canada.

Obviously across this country, and it is no different in my riding of Haldimand—Norfolk, the main concern of Canadians today is jobs and the downturn of the economy. I do not think that this House or this government over the past few years have addressed the concerns of Canadians.

Canadians are scared. They are scared either because they do not have a job or because they cannot find a job. They are wondering where their next meal is going to come from or they are concerned for the job that they have. In fact they believe that the recession may not be over. Whether we are in government or not, they blame members of Parliament for not being able to solve this problem.

I have had a number of constituents come to me and say: "You have 296 people in there. Can you not put your minds together to actually come up with some solution to these tough times? Can you not all sit down and agree to some sort of agreement as to at least one single plan in order to move forward and give Canadians jobs and opportunities?"

Of course, I tell them that it is not that easy. We in opposition have a difficult time in terms of convincing a majority government. Granted even putting some blame back on us does not sometimes seem to come forward with a lot of solutions either. I think a lot of times we are all to blame in this House.

Some of the stuff we talk about here does not seem to be directly related to what our constituents want us to talk about. But the main focus they want in this Chamber is to move toward putting Canadians back to work. I do not believe that we as a Parliament in this past session have been able to provide Canadians with any sort of ideas of how we can help solve this problem.

• (2200)

I would hope that after the upcoming election, once this Chamber is renewed and we have a number of new people maybe then the government of the day, which of course I hope will be on our side, will be able to come up with some of the solutions and ideas that Canadians are looking for.

In my area, along with employment and along with providing opportunities for Canadians in terms of education and in furthering their education to get employment, a lot of my constituents are concerned about the state of the agriculture industry.

In the past I have done a lot of talking about agriculture. I have always said that our farms are the most productive and adaptive in the world and that they provide high quality food. I think I will get agreement on all sides of the House that that is what they do.

Unfortunately we have seen over the past few years the decline of agriculture in Canada. We have seen at the international level major challenges and major attacks on agriculture. We have had our supply managed industries attacked. As my hon. colleague said earlier, there does not seem to be on the government side of this House any commitment to taking this fight right to the limit.

Unfortunately what we have seen is a government that has caved in at the GATT and has not been truly committed to keeping the supply managed industries. The agriculture minister in the past little while has made speeches and the different members of the government here made speeches which have not given any comfort that our supply managed commodities will continue.

What the government says is that some form of tariffication is a solution to our problems, that somehow under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, that will be allowable and our farmers will just do fine. Well that is not the case. I am really not sure if the government has come to any sort of understanding of the importance of the supply managed commodities in terms of its effects on the rural infrastructures.

I know we have a number of rural members here tonight and I want to say to them that in rural Canada times are getting tough. In rural Canada when a government closes down post offices, as in the hon. minister's riding, when it closes down opportunities, when it closes down certain programs that help fund rural agriculture it makes times difficult.

We have been doubly hurt in southwestern Ontario over the past few years because the government has not committed any special programs to southwestern Ontario. We have funding programs for northern Ontario, in some of the areas of Canada and some of the smaller provinces. In my area, which is in the southwest between major centres, we have difficulty in terms of creating employment opportunities for our people. Unfortunately the government has provided no programs to help give them opportunities for jobs.

• (2205)

As I said, agriculture is important in my area. I have fought many fights in this House regarding my tobacco farmers as I mentioned earlier in reference to my Whip. Over the past few years the government has not provided any sort of alternatives to these farmers. It has talked a lot about certain programs, but these programs have not been around the last two years. The REDUX program has not been available to these farmers to help them deal with some of their problems. The Alternate Enterprise Initiative program which is to help farmers move into other areas has not been available the last year.

Before I go I want to talk about trade. Canadians get a sense, right or wrong, and that is debatable on the other side, that the free trade deal has not benefited this country. I hear that from people throughout Canada and in fact people are coming forward and saying that. We are finding out we do not have access to the American market that was promised in the free trade deal.

I feel that this government, instead of negotiating a NAFTA and adding another country into the pot, should first solve some of the problems of this deal. We have debated that over the past few years and it seems to me that the government once again is just moving ahead on this issue without first addressing some of the concerns and some of the problems that Canadians have had in terms of trade.

The biggest problem we have in generating jobs in our area is small businesses. Small businesses just do not have adequate financing. The Small Businesses Loans Act needs reform and adjustment.

This government has not addressed the concerns of small businesses in this country. In my area small businesses that want to create jobs and could create many jobs are being closed down by banks. I know hon. members are experiencing the same problems in their areas where banks are really getting tough because of some of the difficult times.

The Federal Business Development Bank should be out there helping these companies. In my area in particular, the Federal Business Development Bank has been acting more like a bank than as it should. I know hon. members were here when that bank was set up. These business people do not have access to the capital they need to create jobs. Unfortunately without access to this capital there will not be the jobs available.

In conclusion, Madam Speaker, I want to particularly thank the Chair and yourself for the fine job you have done in this Chamber over the past few years. I know we have been on some delegations together and I saw you in action on the weekend at the Conservative convention. I think you did a great job there. I also want to take the opportunity to thank my leader and my Whip for their fine work in this House. I look forward to seeing my colleagues across the floor after the next election. I will save a seat right here for the hon. member and I am sure it will fit him well.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alfonso Gagliano (Saint-Léonard): Madam Speaker, I realize only a few minutes are left for comments, before we adjourn. I don't intend to spend a lot of time commenting on the remarks and statistics of the government House leader who presented the motion

this afternoon or on looking at this government's record. I think time and history will take care of that.

• (2210)

In any case, soon an election will be called, during which these issues will be debated. This afternoon, all my colleagues made it clear where they stood.

Today, and especially this afternoon, members paid tribute to several colleagues. They referred to the classes of '68 and the class of '72, and I would like to congratulate all classes. A number of members announced they would not run in the next election. So, whatever their class or the year they arrived here in this House, I want to congratulate them and wish them good luck, health and happiness and a successful career in the field of their choice. I want to stress their dedication to this country and to Canadians. They were elected, they came here and they took part in the proceedings of this House.

In 1984 I had the honour and the privilege to be elected as a member of Parliament. In fact, Madam Speaker, you and I belong to the same class, since we both arrived in the 1984 election. But two and a half years ago, when my leader, the Leader of the Opposition, appointed me chief opposition Whip, I was able to find out more about this House and to appreciate it and the way it operates. Often, through the media and television, Canadians witness scenes or moments that are positively electrifying. That is because of the kind of political system we have on both sides of this House. But also what Canadians do not see and do not know is that in most cases this House operates with the unanimous agreement of the various parties.

As Whip, I had this honour and privilege to work with the three parties and even at times with some independent members so that this House could operate and really work toward the main objective we all have, that is to serve our fellow citizens as well as possible and to make this beautiful country, Canada, work. It is a modern country which everyone loves. People all over the world would pay fortunes and give all they have to come to live here and share in our happiness and prosperity.

I see here all these good pages who have served us during this time and I thank them for their work—I think I speak on behalf of all my colleagues when I say that. Congratulations and hear, hear.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Gagliano: I trust that many of them will be able to return here as elected members.

Madam Speaker, I would like to commend you for what you have done, especially in these last few weeks since our Speaker fell ill and had to be away. On behalf of the Official Opposition, I congratulate you, because you have performed brilliantly. I know that it is not easy, especially during Question Period. But I congratulate you on a job well done.

I want to thank our Clerk and his colleagues at the table, all the staff and the people at *Hansard*. I know that it takes many people to make this House work and we thank them all for their help and support. I would like to thank my colleagues, the government Whip and all his staff for their co–operation, as well as the New Democratic Party Whip, the House leaders, my own staff, my fellow members, the opposition House leader and all his staff and of course the constables and all the employees who belong to this big House of Commons family, and the messengers who help us do a job that can be difficult and hectic at times.

• (2215)

Here we are now at the end of this third session and I might add perhaps at the end of this 34th Parliament, since an election will soon be called. So thanks to all for their cooperation. My experience as Whip was wonderful and I would recommend it, although there are difficult moments.

[*English*]

My colleague before was saying that sometimes he did not listen to the Whip and he had a choice whether to listen to his constituents or the party Whip. It is not an easy job being a Whip. On the other hand after a long day like today one goes home and thinks about it. After all the trouble and all the misery I can say that it is worth while. It has been a pleasure. I think these past two and a half years have been the best two and a half years of my political career.

Madam Speaker, I thank you, all your colleagues in the chair, Mr. Speaker John Fraser, the Clerk, the pages, the constables, the messengers and everybody involved with this operation. Have a good summer.

We will let Canadians decide and hopefully we will be back here next fall.

Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of Communications): Madam Speaker, I wonder if I could prevail upon the patience of my colleagues just for one minute or two simply to express a word on behalf of colleagues on this side seconding the comments that were made by the chief opposition Whip with regard to the extraordinary contribution that has been made by all of the people who help us on a day to day basis to discharge our responsibilities as members of Parliament.

I certainly have exactly the same thoughts as my friend the chief opposition Whip when it comes to the pages who are called upon among other things to be extraordinary students. They are all straight A scholars with no problems at all in missing classes. They still ace all of their examinations. There is this incredible good cheer that they show always. They have patience when long-winded cabinet ministers and others make speeches late at night. They constantly bring good cheer to all of the proceedings here in the House of Commons.

I agree with my friend that it would be very desirable to see many of them back here one day as members of Parliament. My only fear is that their exposure to Parliament may cause them as a result of the experience to go into the church, sell real estate or doing anything else rather than spend more time here. I hope that we have not dissuaded them from wanting to make a career in public life.

I do finally want to express two final thoughts. The first is a word of goodbye and thank you to so many of my colleagues who I have been privileged to serve here with who have decided not to stand in the next election. It is an enormous privilege to be able to work with so many dedicated men and women from all different parties in the House of Commons who are here simply to serve Canada.

Finally I wish to express to you, Madam Speaker, and to all of your staff in the House of Commons—all of your colleagues, the clerks at the table and all of the other staff who contribute so much—a very sincere word of thanks for all of their dedicated service on behalf of Canadians. It is a privilege to work with each and every one of them.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Before putting the question to the House I would like to say a few words.

It seems somehow different to close a session. I just said a little while ago that I do not see the member for Saint-Denis, now Senator Prud'homme, being the very last member to speak. I can just see him somehow opening the door in the lobby. I know he could not resist. I will at least greet him in the name of all our members.

Colleagues, a few weeks ago I undertook a huge responsibility when our Speaker became ill. If I can use the vernacular that was common in my former life I would say that being John Fraser's understudy is not an easy task. He is and will remain one of the great Speakers that this House has ever known and the tribute that was offered to him today proves it abundantly.

If it was relatively easy for me to do this job I owe it to members from all sides of the House, from the government side, the opposition, the NDP and our independent members as well.

[*Translation*]

I would like to thank those who made that little extra effort or extended the everyday courtesies which made my life easier. Of course, our Clerk, his assistant and all his team are dedicated and talented people who are always there to help the person occupying the chair, as well as to help hon. members.

You will also allow me to say a brief word of thanks to my team, both on the Hill and in my riding, who worked extra hard.

[*English*]

I want to say thank you as well to the Speaker's staff who were really fantastic, who accepted me as one of the family, as we were all praying for Mr. Speaker's recovery.

To all of you, to our pages, to those of you who direct them and help them, we will miss you. I do hope that you miss us. Thank you very much.

Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

Motion agreed to.

[*Translation*]

Madam Deputy Speaker: It being 10.21 p.m., the House stands adjourned until Monday, September 20, 1993 at 11 a.m., pursuant to order made earlier today.

The House adjourned at 10.21 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, June 23, 1993

The House met at 1.25 p.m.

Prayers

[*Translation*]

Madam Deputy Speaker: I wish to inform the House that pursuant to order made Wednesday, June 16, 1993, I have summoned the House today for the sole purpose of giving royal assent to some bills.

* * *

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Madam Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed the following bills without amendment: Bill C-121, an act to amend the Canada Shipping Act and to amend another act in consequence thereof; Bill C-123, an act respecting the management of certain property seized or restrained in connection with certain offences, the disposition of certain property on the forfeiture thereof and the sharing of the proceeds of disposition therefrom in certain circumstances; Bill C-62, an act respecting telecommunications; Bill C-122, an act to amend the Customs Tariff (textile tariff reduction); Bill C-109, an act to amend the Criminal Code, the Crown Liability and Proceedings act and the Radiocommunication Act; Bill C-103, an act to provide for repeal of the Land Titles Act and to amend other Acts in relation thereto; Bill C-101, an act to amend the Canada Labour Code and the Public Service Staff Relations Act; Bill C-110, an act respecting the Northumberland Strait Crossing; Bill C-115, an act to implement the North American Free Trade Agreement; Bill C-126, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Young Offenders Act; Bill C-128, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Customs Tariff (child pornography and corrupting morals); Bill C-106, an act to amend certain petroleum related acts in respect of Canadian ownership requirements and to confirm the validity of a certain regulation.

* * *

• (1330)

[*English*]

THE ROYAL ASSENT

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order. I have the honour to inform the House that a communication has been received as follows:

Government House
Ottawa

June 23, 1993

Mr. Speaker,

I have the honour to inform you that the Honourable Beverley McLachlin, Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, in her capacity as Deputy Governor General, will proceed to the Senate chamber today, the 23rd day of June, 1993 at 1.15 p.m., for the purpose of giving Royal Assent to certain bills.

Yours sincerely,

Judith A. LaRocque
Secretary to the Governor General

[*Translation*]

A message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod as follows:

Madam Speaker, the Honourable Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this honourable House in the Chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, the Speaker with the House went up to the Senate Chamber.

• (1335)

And being returned:

Madam Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that when the House went up to the Senate chamber the Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the royal assent to the following bills:

Royal Assent

Bill C-72, an act to establish the National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy—Chapter No. 31.

Bill C-107, an act to amend the Explosives Act—Chapter No. 32.

Bill C-124, an act to amend the Currency Act—Chapter No. 33.

Bill C-125, an act to correct certain anomalies, inconsistencies, archaisms and errors in the Statutes of Canada, to deal with other matters of a non-controversial and uncomplicated nature in those Statutes and to repeal certain provisions of those Statutes that have expired or lapsed or otherwise ceased to have effect—Chapter No. 34.

Bill C-89, an act to amend the Investment Canada Act—Chapter No. 35.

Bill C-121, an act to amend the Canada Shipping Act and to amend another Act in consequence thereof—Chapter No. 36.

Bill C-123, an act respecting the management of certain property seized or restrained in connection with certain offences, the disposition of certain property on the forfeiture thereof and the sharing of the proceeds of disposition therefrom in certain circumstances—Chapter No. 37.

Bill C-62, an act respecting telecommunications—Chapter No. 38.

Bill C-122, an act to amend the Customs Tariff (textile tariff reduction)—Chapter No. 39.

Bill C-109, an act to amend the Criminal Code, the Crown Liability and Proceedings Act and the Radiocommunication Act—Chapter No. 40.

Bill C-103, an act to provide for the repeal of the Land Titles Act and to amend other Acts in relation thereto—Chapter No. 41.

Bill C-101, an act to amend the Canada Labour Code and the Public Service Staff Relations Act—Chapter No. 42.

Bill C-110, an act respecting the Northumberland Strait Crossing—Chapter No. 43.

Bill C-115, an act to implement the North American Free Trade Agreement—Chapter No. 44.

Bill C-126, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Young Offenders Act—Chapter No. 45.

Bill C-128, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Customs Tariff (child pornography and corrupting morals)—Chapter No. 46.

Bill C-106, an act to amend certain petroleum-related Acts in respect of Canadian ownership requirements and to confirm the validity of a certain regulation—Chapter No. 47.

[*English*]

It being 1.36 p.m., pursuant to order made Wednesday, June 23, 1993, this House stands further adjourned to the call of the Chair until Monday, September 20, 1993 at 11 a.m.

The House adjourned at 1.36 p.m.

[*Editor's note: The thirty-fourth Parliament was dissolved on Wednesday, September 8, 1993, by proclamation of His Excellency the Governor General.*]